

tant, indorsing immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8684. Also, resolution of the American Legion Post, No. 92, North Judson, Ind., conveyed through L. C. Speerg, commander, and A. J. Luster, adjutant, indorsing immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates as proposed in House bill 3493; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8685. Also, resolution of the American Legion Post, No. 595, at Ohiopyle, Pa., conveyed through E. F. Creegan, post adjutant, urging immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8686. Also, resolution of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post No. 864, at Brookline, Mass., conveyed by Peter W. Pate, post commander, indorsing the immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates as proposed in House bill 3493; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8687. By Mr. FRANK M. RAMEY: Petition of Local Union No. 1475, United Mine Workers of America, Panama, Ill., urging 6-hour workday and 5-day work week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8688. By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Petition from the Trades and Labor Council of Wichita Falls, Tex., Carpenters' Local Union No. 977, Painters' Local Union No. 393; Retail Merchants' Association, and other like organizations, indorsing the move of the independent oil operators for an embargo on crude oil and its by-products from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8689. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of Aitkin County (Minn.) Tax Reduction League, urging the enactment of Senate bill 4123, to provide drainage bonds and thereby relieving the tax burden on many counties in Minnesota; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

8690. By Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia: Petition of Council of Jewish Women of West Virginia, by Mrs. Frances L. Moses, of Charleston, W. Va., urging Congress to provide for family integrity and admission of relatives of citizens and resident aliens in any immigration legislation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 19, 1931

(Legislative day of Monday, January 5, 1931)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	La Follette	Shipstead
Barkley	Frazier	McGill	Shortridge
Bingham	George	McKellar	Simmons
Black	Gillett	McMaster	Smith
Blaine	Glass	McNary	Smoot
Borah	Glenn	Metcalf	Steiwer
Bratton	Goff	Morrison	Stephens
Brock	Goldsborough	Morrow	Swanson
Brookhart	Gould	Moses	Thomas, Idaho
Broussard	Hale	Norbeck	Thomas, Okla.
Bulkley	Harris	Norris	Townsend
Capper	Harrison	Nye	Trammell
Caraway	Hastings	Oddie	Tydings
Carey	Hatfield	Partridge	Vandenberg
Connally	Hawes	Patterson	Wagner
Copeland	Hayden	Phippis	Walcott
Couzens	Hebert	Pine	Walsh, Mass.
Cutting	Heflin	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Howell	Ransdell	Waterman
Davis	Jones	Reed	Watson
Deneen	Kean	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler
Dill	Kendrick	Schall	Williamson
Fess	Keyes	Sheppard	

Mr. WATSON. I desire to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] is absent on account of illness in his family. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

RADIO BROADCASTING AS RELATED TO LABOR

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, there are 12 channels of radio given to corporations formed for the specific purpose of broadcasting, 7 channels to corporations manufacturing radio equipment and supplies, 10 channels to corporations dealing in merchandise of various kinds, 11 channels to corporations publishing newspapers, 3 channels to public-utility corporations, 5 channels to insurance corporations, and no channel to the great body of American labor. I present a resolution of the American Federation of Labor upon that subject, and ask that it may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSING RADIO BROADCASTING RIGHTS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF AGRICULTURE, LABOR, AND INTERIOR

During the convention of the American Federation of Labor, held in Boston, October 6-17, resolutions were adopted urging Congress to adopt House Joint Resolution 334, which provides that the Federal Radio Commission shall assign three cleared-channel broadcasting frequencies to the Departments of Agriculture, Labor, and Interior. The resolutions are sent to you for your consideration, and I hope for favorable action. They are as follows:

"Whereas WCFL, the 'voice of labor' radio broadcast station, operating on 970 kilocycles, and W9XAA, its recently installed short-wave relay broadcast station, operating on 6,080 kilocycles, is the only radio station in the world which is owned, controlled, and operated by the labor movement; and

"Whereas WCFL-W9XAA, indorsed by the American Federation of Labor, and its affiliated national, international, and State organizations, is justly entitled to one of the national, cleared, unlimited-time channels out of the 90 available; and

"Whereas radio takes its place alongside of the development of the printing press and the establishment of the public school; it is the supermeans of entertainment, education, and propaganda. Whoever controls radio broadcasting in the years to come will control the Nation. For good or ill, radio will pour into the homes of the land, into the minds and hearts of the people, a constant stream of song and story, of history, science, economics, politics, and propaganda. Overshadowing and outreaching all other means of communication, radio has become the unrivaled master of human destiny; and

"Whereas radio broadcasting is the most effective means known to man for influencing public opinion. More people listen to the radio than read all the daily newspapers in the land. The mind can not conceive of the influence which radio is destined to exert upon the thinking, the habits, the character, and the progress of mankind; and

"Whereas the 'public interest, necessity, and convenience' require that this marvelous new means of communication should not be placed within the control of a few great monopolistic corporations or handed out as a free gift to a few hundred private business concerns for commercial exploitation; and

"Whereas the 'public interest, necessity, and convenience' require that radio broadcasting provide not only for entertainment but information, not only music but science, history, economics, and all other things that make for human welfare. It requires that the serious problems of life shall be presented, not from one group or one viewpoint only but from many groups and many points of view; and

"Whereas the 'public interest, necessity, and convenience' is nation-wide, it is age long; it has to do with the physical, mental, moral, social, and economic welfare of all of the people; and

"Whereas the 'public interest, necessity, and convenience' which the law fixes as the sole test for granting radio licenses is the same as the 'public welfare,' being that which contributes to the health, comfort, and happiness of the people, which provides wholesome entertainment, increases knowledge, arouses individual thinking, inspires noble impulses, strengthens human ties, breaks down hatreds, encourages respect for law, aids employment, improves the standard of living, and adds to the peace and contentment of mankind; and

"Whereas like the air we breath or the sunlight that gives us life, radio must be charged with a public trust—the heritage of mankind—and no man or corporation must be permitted to appropriate it any more than they should be permitted to appropriate the air or the ocean; and

"Whereas organized labor has contributed immeasurable service to the Nation; it has vastly improved working conditions, raised the standard of living, infused hope and courage and patriotism into millions of hearts; it has battled for needed reforms, sane and useful legislation, and social and economic justice for all who toil; it has established principles, policies, and ideals which are as essential to the welfare of our country as is sunlight to the growing fields; it has a message for all mankind; it asks no monopoly, no special privilege, no right to exploit the air for commercial profit, but asks only that it be allowed to use 1 of the 90 available radio channels in order that it may freely promulgate the principles and ideals and thereby protect and serve the entire public; and

"Whereas evidence of the tendency of the Federal Radio Commission to allocate the most desirable wave lengths to private corporations, in disregard of the public interest, necessity, and convenience, is demonstrated by the fact that the 40 'cleared radio broadcasting channels' established by the Federal Radio Commission have been allocated as follows (some of part time only):

"(1) Twelve channels to corporations formed for the specific purpose of operating a broadcasting station;

"(2) Seven channels to corporations manufacturing radio equipment and supplies;

"(3) Ten channels to corporations dealing in merchandise of various kinds;

"(4) Eleven channels to corporations publishing newspapers;

"(5) Three channels to public-utility corporations;

"(6) Five channels to insurance corporations;

"(7) One channel (limited time) to a fraternal organization; and

"(8) One channel to municipal corporation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Federation of Labor, in its fiftieth annual convention assembled in Boston, Mass., this 7th day of October, 1930, indorse House Joint Resolution No. 334, introduced on May 9, 1930, by Congressman REIN, of Illinois (who was impelled to introduce this resolution on account of the arbitrary and biased action of the Federal Radio Commission in denying a cleared channel to the station of organized labor, WCFL), to amend the radio act of 1927 by providing that the Federal Radio Commission shall assign three cleared-channel broadcasting frequencies to the Departments of Agriculture, Labor, and Interior, which shall be licensed to the radio stations recommended by the heads of those Government departments as being most representative of the labor, agricultural, and educational interests of the United States.

SECRETARY OF LABOR DOAK ON IMMIGRATION

Mr. GOFF. Mr. President, I ask that there may be printed in the RECORD a radio address on the question of immigration delivered on Saturday night, January 17, by the Hon. W. N. Doak, Secretary of Labor.

It reflects a deep knowledge of economic needs and details. It is exact in its underlying and suggestive message, that economy is the source of all revenue, just as the active virtue of employment is essential to prosperity and happiness. Its generalizations are very wise and most helpful. It reflects a systematic investigation in every department of our social and economic life. It vividly presents the evil of overproduction in labor surplus. It challenges attention and appeals to the very heart of our present-day public opinion, which after all, is the controlling force for good in any nation, when man thinks before he acts, and never judges effects without comprehending the causes. In fact, it reminds us how we grew out of little or nothing by heeding the precept of live and let live. It finds a resultant in our national life that can be maintained, if we will check the radical and spur up the conservative, until each feels that a government can not allow its citizens or its subjects to live in destitution. It aims to protect and uplift those who labor, by giving them employment, peace, happiness, and culture. It so conserves, advances, and stabilizes capital that an income is assured. In a word, it sounds the warning that steady employment is the poor man's mint, and the beginning of all capitalistic savings. It incarnates into our thought the very ideals of our American Republic: That he who provides not for his own household is worse than an infidel. I commend it, Mr. President, and deem it a privilege to introduce it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Secretary Doak spoke as follows:

My radio friends, I have been requested to speak to you to-night on the subject of immigration, a subject which has always been of vital interest to our people, but which of late has been more widely discussed before the committees in Congress and in many of the public forums throughout the country than ever before. In recent months it has been proposed that during the present emergency, especially, immigration should be suspended altogether. It has also been advocated that a further limitation be placed on the number of entrants permitted to come in, so that but a small percentage of the number admissible under existing laws would be permitted to enter the country. The question of further restriction in immigration is now receiving the attention of the Immigration Committee of the Congress.

In late years the need for a still further limitation in immigration has been apparent to all who are really interested in the well-being of all our people, whether native or foreign born. I am one of those who has always believed that our first duty is to safeguard the interests of our own people. I also believe in strict en-

forcement of our immigration laws, but in a just and humane way.

Our Government has always given to those who have entered our gates from other lands that freedom of opportunity and protection of law that it accords to its citizens. In return we have asked only of those admitted that they observe our laws, show their faith in our institutions, and maintain a sympathetic attitude with our form of government. Immigrants, from the beginning, have flocked to America to better themselves. Economic forces rather than political freedom actuated the great majority who came to our shores; and this applies to the modern immigrants, who wander from their homes and, as their forefathers did, eagerly search for a more assured means of livelihood and prosperity.

Of course, there are some people in the United States who oppose the restriction of immigration on any basis. Restricted immigration is also opposed as a departure from a time-honored policy. When this Republic was founded we had much undeveloped territory and immigration was encouraged. We needed agricultural labor to farm the lands, other labor to build railroads and to aid in the development of a new country. But of late years there are comparatively few of the immigrants arriving who go to the farms, and there is generally sufficient other labor here for practically all our needs. There may be instances where a particular kind of labor is required for the best interests of developing a new industry, but even these instances are very much limited in the present emergency. Modern methods of production and improved labor-saving machinery have curtailed the opportunities, particularly for common labor. The great bulk of all immigrants who come here come here to work; and where we have enough labor in this country we are proceeding upon a false premise when we accentuate our employment problems by encouraging a flow of immigration which can not be absorbed and will only increase the number who must be provided with employment.

I regret to say that some of those who have entered this country have not been actuated by the desire to improve their opportunities and to join with us in the upbuilding and upholding of our institutions. They come here for other purposes, as you know. For this latter class—and I am thankful that they are comparatively few—there is no place in this country. If they are not in sympathy with our aims and purposes, if they do not come here for the purpose of founding homes and joining with us in all our national endeavors, if they do not come here to embrace our principles, then they should return to the place from whence they came, because we can get along pretty well without them.

Nothing can be clearer than that our whole future structure as a great national commonwealth rests upon the uninterrupted continuation of all the standards—social, economic, and political—coupled with Christian civilization, which have brought us forward from our first strike for independence and the determination to found a land of freedom. Thus we must cling to self-preservation with sufficient zeal to see that our national customs, traditions, and progress are not injured by any immigrant group which by deed or thought does not subscribe heartily to all those standards.

Because of the many physical difficulties that beset us by reason of our extensive boundaries and the number of our ports of entry, there are many aliens who are in this country illegally. Just how many of this class there may be it is hard to enumerate.

Accurate information is so limited that any statement which essays to show the number of aliens who are now unlawfully resident here must necessarily be largely conjectural.

Our first numerical restrictive immigration law was enacted in the year 1921. Prior to that year there were few incentives for European aliens to seek entry into the United States in violation of law, and, therefore, during this period those who deliberately entered the country in an unlawful manner were, for the most part, limited to the diseased, illiterate, and the criminal and immoral classes, who could not gain lawful admission. It is a known fact, of course, that many of these classes succeeded in entering the country during this period, and undoubtedly some are still here.

A materially different situation existed with respect to the entry of residents of Canada and Mexico during this same period. Prior to the year 1907 the immigration regulations provided that no record should be made of Canadians and Mexicans entering the country, except in certain limited classes of cases. During the continuation of these regulations an unknown but very large number of immigrants entered from both of these countries. And even between the years 1907 and 1921 the land boundaries between the United States and Canada and Mexico were virtually unprotected, making it easy for aliens in these countries to cross our borders without inspection. Obviously, it is impossible even to estimate the number of such entries, or to determine how many of them are still in the United States.

At the time the quota limit act of 1921 went into effect it was a well-known fact that there were several million prospective immigrants in European countries desiring to come to the United States, and very naturally the numerical restriction imposed by that law created a strong incentive to illegal entry. During the period between June, 1921, and July 1, 1924, while the first quota limit act was in effect, a large but unknown number gained surreptitious entry over the land borders and from Cuba by way of Florida and other States bordering on the Gulf of Mexico, and as stowaways and deserting seamen at our seaports. Between the years 1907 and 1921 the total number of seamen recorded as deserting their ships in American ports was 145,492, an average of 9,699 per year. Between 1921 and 1924 this annual average

increased to 21,362. This is only one indication that many thousands of persons resorted to unlawful means of effecting entry.

Another fact to be borne in mind is that a large number of those who entered the country surreptitiously during the three years above named were Europeans, and that this same law imposed practically no restriction on immigration from Canada and Mexico.

July 1, 1924, an even more restrictive quota act was enacted by Congress, and, while it is impossible to make a satisfactory estimate of the number of aliens who have entered the country unlawfully during the last six years, yet it is certain that the annual number was not nearly so great as previously; this for the reason that a highly efficient immigration border patrol has been on guard at the land borders in Florida and at strategic points on the Gulf coast since that date.

Through the effective work performed by this organization the illegal entry of Europeans across our land boundaries has been very greatly diminished. Also through the increased number of immigration officers stationed at our various ports of entry the number of aliens who deserted ships in American ports has been reduced to an average of 10,929 in the last three years, and while, as previously stated, it is obviously impossible to arrive at any concrete figure as to the number of aliens unlawfully in the United States, after a careful consideration of all factors which enter into a computation of this kind, I recently estimated this number to be about 400,000, of which number experience would indicate only about 25 per cent (or 100,000) will be found to come within the deportation provisions of the present immigration law and be found deportable.

As of interest to the people of the United States I desire to say that during the past 10 years a total of 92,157 aliens have been deported under warrant proceedings, and during the past six years, for which records have been kept, 95,147 aliens subject to deportation have been permitted to depart voluntarily without warrant proceedings, or an aggregate of 187,304 aliens.

However, it should be borne in mind that in most instances those who have been permitted to depart voluntarily without warrant proceedings have had to be apprehended by the immigration authorities before they requested the privilege of departing voluntarily.

We are calling to the attention of the Congress and those in authority the vital importance of strengthening the hands of the Labor Department in its work of deporting aliens who have no right to remain here. We have asked for what we consider suitable appropriations for carrying on this necessary work. And I think it is but just for me to state that our requests are receiving favorable and sympathetic consideration by Congress.

While I shall insist on a vigorous enforcement policy, yet in the performance of this particular phase of the immigration law it is my intention to avoid any spectacular raids or sensational methods in accomplishing the desired results.

It is well to call to your attention some of the difficulties encountered by immigration officers in deportation cases. Experience has demonstrated that it would not be possible to effect the deportation in any one year of all deportable aliens, nor would it be safe to predict that such results could be accomplished in any period of years, because of the various steps which must be followed under the law in effecting deportation. Among these steps are the following:

- First. Locating the alien.
- Second. Making a case which will bear the test of the courts, which oftentimes entails the gathering of evidence over an extensive area.
- Third. Determining the country of which the alien is a citizen or subject.
- Fourth. Obtaining consent of the country to which deportation is ordered.

From this you will readily see that deporting an alien is not a simple matter and does not consist in taking him into custody, putting him on a boat, and bidding him Godspeed back to his native country.

Let me impress upon you the growing perplexities with which we are confronted in the influence which immigration wields upon our economic situation and the future of our native-born and naturalized workers. It is no longer solely a question of supplying our labor needs through the importation of foreign labor. It is now a question of protecting the interests of our citizens and the lawfully resident aliens now here, and it also involves the maintenance of our American standards of living.

That our immigration laws need strengthening in legal applications to the present situation is evidenced more and more each year. What I have just told you is proof of our needs.

While it may be to many a matter of regret that the United States can no longer be regarded as a refuge for the oppressed peoples of the world, as a matter of fact the restriction of immigration was not adopted by the United States until its absolute necessity had been demonstrated, and in this connection it is well to remember that our country did not lead in limiting immigration but rather that it followed the example of practically every civilized nation on earth.

As a part of the general plan to relieve unemployment the apprehension and deportation of undesirable aliens will be of great value. Believing our efforts in the direction of a stricter enforcement of our immigration laws to be in the interest of the general welfare of American institutions, we earnestly solicit the sympathetic support of all our citizens in these endeavors.

Thank you, and good night.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14675) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], on which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] is entitled to the floor.

The amendment of Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas was, at the proper place in the bill, to insert:

There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$25,000,000 (in addition to such sum as may be or may become available through voluntary contributions), to be immediately available and to be expended by the American National Red Cross for the purpose of supplying food, medicine, medical aid, and other essentials to afford adequate human relief in the present national emergency, to persons otherwise unable to procure the same. Any portion of this appropriation unexpended on June 30, 1932, shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to make a motion and then to speak upon it. I move that the consideration of the amendment now pending to House bill 14675 be made a special order for 2 o'clock on February 9, 1931.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. If I understand the motion of the Senator correctly, the Interior Department appropriation bill would be laid aside and no action would be taken upon it by the Senate until February 9.

Mr. REED. That would be the effect of the motion.

Mr. SMOOT. I understand that would be its effect.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to explain my reason for making the motion. Last September the Red Cross undertook the relief of those in distress in the drought-stricken areas, outside of such relief as could be provided through credit operations either of the Government or the banks, and assigned the \$5,000,000 reserve fund which they had to that purpose. They started off in September with a fund of \$5,000,000 which had been raised by voluntary contribution, and by deliberate decision assigned that amount to human relief; that is, for food, medical supplies, and other forms of relief of suffering humanity in those stricken regions. They established a committee in every county of the drought-stricken States last September. Those committees consist usually of the leading citizens of those counties who have volunteered for the work and who are unpaid. They have been working faithfully and manfully since September in affording the sort of relief we have been talking about to the people of those regions. The method by which they do it has been in most cases to give purchase orders directed to the merchants of the various communities. Those purchase orders have been given usually in units of about \$5. That system has gone on now for nearly six months. It has worked well.

When the means of the local Red Cross chapters have proven to be inadequate they have instructions, and it has been their practice, to call upon their regional director, and through him to call upon the national treasury of the Red Cross for help. In every case such calls have been responded to.

The advantages of the system are very obvious, because the conditions of suffering vary greatly between families even and vary in the same families from week to week. As temporary employment is secured by some member of the family, the distress is tided over for a few days. The local committee knows that and can adjust its action accordingly, or as employment may be lost the local committee knows that and can give instant relief.

The Senate may be interested to know that the riots which we heard about two weeks ago that happened in the town of England, Ark., were not in truth riots but were caused by a number of needy people who had come into the

local community to obtain their purchase orders, according to custom, only to discover that the supply of blanks, which have to be carefully printed in order to prevent forgery, was exhausted and they would have to wait a couple of days before new blanks could be secured from the central headquarters. They went to the merchants, and the merchants refused to advance foodstuffs without the presentation of the actual orders. Then those people went home, came back the next day, got their blanks, and obtained their supplies. There was not any riot whatsoever.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. CARAWAY. How did the Senator from Pennsylvania get his information?

Mr. REED. I got my information through Mr. Harvey Couch and through Mr. Lucey, the regional director in charge of the work, and through their reports submitted to the Washington headquarters.

Mr. CARAWAY. Neither one of them was there.

Mr. REED. But Mr. Lucey went there and made a personal investigation to see what had actually happened, and that is his report of what actually happened.

Mr. President, these local committees, as I have said, have instructions, and it has been their practice, to have recourse to their regional directors and to the central headquarters of the Red Cross if their local resources are not sufficient to take care of the local demands. That situation continued until the opening of Congress, and on that occasion, in his message, the President outlined the situation in the drought-stricken areas and recommended that Congress should make appropriations which would enable the rehabilitation of agriculture through loans for feed, fertilizer, and seed. In his message the President told Congress that the Red Cross had the situation in hand so far as human relief was concerned.

An effort was made, as we remember, to add the word "food" to that farm relief bill for the drought areas. If that word had been added, it would have imposed an extra burden upon the farmers of those regions, because loans made to them for the purchase of food for human beings would have been a lien upon their coming crops, and in many cases the lien thus constituted would have been in excess of the value of the crops themselves; so that the farmer relieved in that fashion would have faced insolvency at the end of his crop season.

When bills were introduced in compliance with the President's message they were expanded to include human relief in the manner indicated, and it was only when it became clear that it would have that effect upon the farmer and further that it would not give any relief whatever to the people of the towns in the stricken areas who are equally in distress that the item of food was omitted; because, bear in mind, the clerks who are out of employment and the small merchants in the towns in the drought-stricken areas, whom nobody pays these days, are in just as much distress as are the farmers in the agricultural communities on which they depend, and there was no means in that drought relief bill by which any advances, either loans or gifts, could have been made to those people in the small towns throughout the stricken areas. That was the reason, I believe, why the committee of the House of Representatives—the conference committee—insisted on the elimination of the items of human relief from those measures and insisted upon intrusting that matter to the Red Cross. Now, it is perfectly obvious that the Red Cross—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to a question?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator understands that crop production in the drought territory is financed largely by loans for feed, seed, fertilizer, and food, the security taken being liens upon the crops?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Will the Senator explain how it is expected to finance crop production by taking a first mortgage on the crops for feed, seed, and fertilizer loans and requiring the landlord and the tenant to waive all claims in favor of mortgages thus taken for those purposes? How is it proposed to finance crop production? Does the Senator expect the Red Cross, under either Federal appropriations or voluntarily contributed funds, to supply sufficient food to enable the farm producers to grow their crops?

Mr. REED. To furnish sufficient food?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. REED. Of course I do; I expect some type of charity to provide food that will tide over the period of distress until the arrival of this year's crops to take care of it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Will the Senator state why he thinks it would be better to depart from the customary method of financing crop production and to make an honorable loan to a farmer with which to feed his mules and then require him to stand in a bread line in order to secure food for his family?

Mr. REED. For the very obvious reason that the farmer can not afford to mortgage his crops for food for himself and his family, and I do not think he ought to be asked to do so.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. But he has been in the habit of doing it; that is the general manner in which he finances his operations.

Mr. REED. Of course it is in years when his crops come along in their turn; but he can not do it now, because he has no last year's crop to base it on, and he is still in debt for the pledges he has made. He never mortgages his last year's crop for this year's production.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If the Senator will permit me a statement there, the Senator's statement is this connection shows clearly the total lack of understanding of those who are trying to prevent the Government supplying loans in connection with the distress in the drought-stricken regions.

Mr. REED. I will have to ask the Senator to allow me to proceed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well; I will take my own time. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REED. Perhaps my lack of understanding of the subject will not appear so terribly evident when I have explained the thought I had in mind. I thought I had made it clear as I went along; but the situation is this: Throughout almost all of the stricken area—and I am not talking particularly of Arkansas; I have no especial knowledge of conditions there, but I do know by personal knowledge and personal visitation the conditions in some of the other drought-stricken regions—it is quite common, and was last year, for the farmer to pledge his expected crop to pay not only his business expenses of the year but to maintain his family through the crop-growing season. When the time of harvest came, however, there was no harvest, and these loans were unpaid and are unpaid to-day. Now, the suggestion of the Senator evidently is, if I have understood his interruption, that the farmer ought to be permitted to go still more heavily in debt, pledging this next coming crop on top of his existing debt to provide not only his agricultural expenses but his living expenses for the growing season.

I say that in all human probability the crops of 1931 will not be sufficient to bear that burden and that the farmer will find himself at harvest time still insolvent. I think that ought to be plain; it certainly would be plain to the Senator from Arkansas if he were listening.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. REED. For a question; yes.

Mr. SMITH. I merely wanted to state that I think the Senator is in error as to the farmer being unable to pay his previous loan. The record shows that in a majority of States where appropriations have been provided for the purpose of supplying loans for the purchase of seed, feed, and fertilizer, the farmer has paid practically all of it back.

The average as stated by the department is something over 87½ per cent, with additional security on crops and warehouses.

Mr. REED. That is not the experience that I have heard in the regions as to which I have made inquiry.

Mr. SMITH. That information is from an official document.

Mr. REED. Is the Senator talking about loans on the crop of 1930?

Mr. SMITH. I am.

Mr. REED. Loans made by the Government?

Mr. SMITH. Loans made by the Government.

Mr. REED. I am not talking only about Government loans; I am talking about the general custom through the farming region of pledging the coming crop for loans from private individuals as well as the Government. We have no record of the amount by which those loans have been paid off.

Mr. SMITH. We have a record of the amount by which the loans made by the Government have been paid off.

Mr. REED. Doubtless, in some States, but not particularly in the drought regions. I have no doubt the percentage is brought up very greatly by the payments outside of the drought area.

Mr. SMITH. I was speaking of those similarly affected by virtue of just the reverse of drought—excess storms and floods—which destroyed crops. They borrowed from the Government, and the payments have been sent in for the loans of 1930, and they aggregate something like 87½ per cent.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, we are considering relief to starving human beings, and this bill does not discuss the question of advances on crops.

Let me start in where I was interrupted. In December it was perfectly obvious that the funds of the Red Cross would not be sufficient to carry the burden which the Red Cross had assumed, and plans were discussed for the raising of an additional fund to take care of the emergency.

It is the custom throughout the country for our community chests to make their appeals in Christmas week, or around New Year's, and much objection had been interposed against the intention of the Red Cross to start a drive at Christmas time to build up its fund. It was said everywhere that that would destroy the effectiveness of the drives of the community chests for their local charities, and on that representation it was agreed that the drive for a Red Cross fund should be postponed, so as to get out of the way of the community-chest drives, and enable them, if they could, to raise their funds.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, was it not testified before the Committee on Appropriations that they had enough money, some \$4,000,000?

Mr. REED. They had enough money for the time being, and Judge Payne was doubtless impressed by the fact that the community-chest drives were on, and it was agreed not to make any appeal for the Red Cross. How strongly he expressed that I do not know, but if he put it as flatly as the Senator quotes him, he made it a little too strong. I understood that the latter part of his remark was that it was enough for the time being, but that they would have to make a drive for further funds. The Senator perhaps remembers his exact language.

Mr. COUZENS. That is not what I saw quoted in the press. I did not read the exact testimony, except what I saw quoted in the press, but in any event the impression went out to the Nation that the Red Cross was satisfactorily financed when Judge Payne was testifying before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. REED. That was the impression I got from reading the papers at the time, but I am told that if one looks at Judge Payne's exact testimony as given, it will be found that he qualified his answer so as to state, in effect, that they had enough money for the present. That is true; at the present moment there is in the treasury of the Red Cross \$3,950,000, all of it available for use in this particular work, and if the Red Cross did not get another cent between

now and February 9 it would be able to carry on at the rate it has been carrying on right up to that time, and beyond it.

Mr. COUZENS, Mr. BARKLEY, and Mr. COPELAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. COUZENS. Is that the reason why the Senator asks to have action postponed until February 9—because they have enough money to last until that time?

Mr. REED. No; not by any means. I might as well anticipate myself now. I was going to explain that.

I am asking to postpone it because I believe the very integrity of the Red Cross is at stake, and I think we ought to postpone a Government contribution to give the Red Cross a chance to put through the drive which they themselves have started to fill up their funds by voluntary offerings.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Now I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the fact that various State agencies which were set up as a result of the effort to relieve the drought situation reported conditions in the various States early in the autumn, and in view of the fact that the winter is half gone now, and that only a million or so of the \$5,000,000 set apart by the Red Cross for this purpose has been spent, if the Senator is correct in saying there are now \$3,900,000 in the treasury—

Mr. REED. They have had contributions since they began this drive. They have spent more than a million, of course.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am wondering how long a period they propose to spread this \$4,500,000 over, and whether they are doling it out so as to see the end of the winter before the \$5,000,000 is expended, and what they propose to do with the local funds which they have collected, whether they have been sent to general headquarters or whether they have been spent locally by those who attempted to raise them.

Mr. REED. They have been spent locally, of course, wherever there were local needs, and where there were not they have been sent to national headquarters. The amount that has been spent is, of course, very much more than a million. It is running about half a million a week, and they are actually taking care of the distress at this moment.

Mr. BARKLEY. They are not. I do not say that as any reflection on the Red Cross, but because I know that in my State they are not. It may be that they are not able to; but whatever the deficiency may be, they actually are not doing it. That does not in any way impugn their good faith. They have not been sent enough money from the outside, and they have not raised enough locally.

Mr. REED. Now, I am coming to my point.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Is not the Senator mistaken about the import of the testimony given by Judge Payne before the committee? In response to a question of my own as to why he did not make an appeal this was his language:

The reason we do not want to make it now is because we are not in need of it.

In view of the statement that I made to you here this morning, if I would go outside and ask for money contributions, you would laugh at me.

That was three days before he did go out and make such an appeal. Certainly, as I see it, I must say to the Senator, Judge Payne gave me the impression, as a member of the committee, that he did not think it was necessary; that they did not need any money.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. He also said—I recall the testimony distinctly—and said with emphasis, that he thought they had sufficient funds to get through the winter on.

Mr. REED. If he said that—and, of course, I accept the Senator's statement that he did—he must have been mistaken, because the amount now in their treasury is, as I have said, \$3,950,000; and they will need every penny of the \$10,000,000 fund they are trying to raise by voluntary subscription.

The drive for the \$10,000,000 fund was initiated by President Hoover at the request of the Red Cross officials. He, acting as president of the Red Cross, issued a proclamation on the 13th of January asking the American people to rise to the emergency and contribute the \$10,000,000 fund for the purpose of relieving starving human beings. The Red Cross has commenced that drive, and I see in the papers this morning that a committee, of which former President Coolidge is honorary chairman, has been organized to help carry through that drive, and it includes distinguished citizens from all over the United States.

That drive can not succeed if the Robinson amendment is adopted by the Senate to-day. Every contributor in the United States will say to himself, "Why should I give my money at this time, when I need it so much myself, if the United States Government is going to take it out of me by taxation and give it for me?"

Mr. BLAINE and Mr. BROOKHART addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BLAINE. On what state of facts does the Senator make the declaration he has just uttered?

Mr. REED. On my experience; on what we all know of human nature; on what I have heard my friends say in recent days; on what I read in every newspaper. Democratic and Republican newspapers this morning unite in saying that the passage of this amendment by the Senate will absolutely wreck the Red Cross drive. Look at this morning's New York World. They know something about human nature. Look at the Washington Post; look at the Philadelphia Ledger; look at the New York Times; look at the New York Herald Tribune. Does the Senator mean to imply that they do not know something about the frame of mind of the people in their communities?

Mr. BLAINE. Another question. I do not know anything about other States, but I would like to ask the Senator if he has any such information concerning my own State, Wisconsin?

Mr. REED. I have no information whatever about it.

Mr. BLAINE. If the Senator will ascertain the facts, he will find that they are quite the contrary to the declaration he has made.

Mr. REED. Then my guess is that Wisconsin will have to raise the whole \$10,000,000, because there is nobody to whom I have talked about it, and no newspaper I have read, but expresses the firm opinion that if the Government is going to give to the Red Cross all chance of raising money through voluntary charity of individuals will have gone.

Mr. FESS, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. COUZENS, and Mr. BROOKHART addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. REED. I yield in all directions, first to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. Confirming what the Senator has just said, I have received telegrams, as the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones] has also received them and placed them in the Record, to this effect: "It is impossible for us to raise the Red Cross quota." Such a telegram comes from Springfield, Ohio, asking me to vote for an appropriation out of the Federal Treasury in lieu of their now raising the money. I have written the judge who wrote me and asked him whether he had looked into the possible effect upon the Red Cross organization of such action on our part, and I asked for a reply to that particular question. His reply indicates that that feature of it had not occurred to him. The result is that they will try to raise their quota.

I think the Senator from Pennsylvania is correct in his statement. This agitation already has gone so far that it is very doubtful whether the \$10,000,000 will be raised.

Mr. REED. I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wonder whether the Senator from Ohio would tell us whether that telegram intimated that if it had not been for the efforts made in the Senate during the last several weeks to get some relief they would have been able to raise their quota in Springfield, Ohio?

Mr. FESS. There was no intimation of that sort.

Mr. BARKLEY. They just made the simple statement that they could not raise it.

Mr. FESS. I will also state, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will yield, that I live within the drought-stricken area, as the Senator knows, but up to date I had not had a single request from anyone in Ohio for relief in this situation until I received the message from Judge Graham, of Springfield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will allow me, on last Saturday I pointed out numbers and numbers of instances where Congress had made appropriations out of the Treasury to relieve suffering on account of disaster, and at the same time the Red Cross had made drives to raise money by private subscription. In those cases the appropriations out of the Public Treasury did not in any way handicap or cripple the Red Cross in its work. How does it happen that in this particular disaster it is claimed that if we appropriate money out of the Public Treasury the Red Cross will be ruined?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am glad to explain that, and if the Senate will bear with me for a few minutes I will answer the question the Senator asked.

I have had looked up the measures passed by Congress over the last century and a quarter when the United States has contributed money for the relief of individuals overcome by disaster, and the record is one of which we can all be very proud. The immediate response to the needs of people overwhelmed by calamity has been entirely creditable to our country. Such things as the San Francisco earthquake, the fire up in the little town of Salem, Mass., and the other cases which have been mentioned all were followed by prompt and rather unwise contributions from the National Government. But there are dozens, yes, hundreds, of cases where we have taken such action, down to the World War.

Then for the first time, at the time of the World War, we got our Red Cross organized on a nation-wide, business-like, efficient, and effective basis. Some system was put into it, some coordination was put into its efforts, and since that time we have not contributed money out of the Federal Treasury in such cases, because all the appeals have been taken care of by the Red Cross with its nation-wide organization, and much more efficiently than the Federal Government could have done it.

Of all the things of which we have been proud, the way we have kept the Red Cross chest filled and the promptness and efficiency with which it has gone to the relief of suffering humanity here and abroad I think is something of which we ought to be most proud.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. COUZENS. I just wanted to ask the Senator if he knew of any movement on foot now for the Red Cross to refuse to accept the proposed contribution if it should be offered by the Government?

Mr. REED. I have not discussed that matter with any of the Red Cross people.

Mr. COUZENS. I know that they are having a meeting here to-day; and I have had intimations that the Red Cross might refuse a Federal contribution for the purposes stated.

Mr. REED. That is for them to say, and not for me.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HOWELL. Assume that the \$10,000,000 were not raised. Would the Senator from Pennsylvania then be in favor of an appropriation?

Mr. REED. Absolutely; I would.

Mr. HOWELL. In view of that fact—and, of course, I feel that others in the Senate would favor it, also—is not

that going to have the same effect upon raising this money that an appropriation right now would have?

Mr. REED. No; I do not think so; and I am glad the Senator asked me that question. I have pretty strong ideas about State rights, and about the Federal Government minding its own business, and all that sort of thing; but when people are in despair and in dire distress, as they are now, I am not going to stand here, to-day or at any other time, and quibble about minutiae of governmental organization. If the Red Cross can not take care of this—and I know it can; I know that the heart of America has not changed, even if it is in a state of business depression; they will get the \$10,000,000—but if they do not, and if the Red Cross can not take care of this distress, I will join with the Senator at any time in appropriating the last cent that the Federal Government has in its Treasury; and I will not stop to quibble about whether it ought to be the Federal Government or the State governments, either.

If the distress exists, we ought to take care of it; but, for Heaven's sake, let us not, by hasty action here, wreck that institution of which we ought to be so proud, the national organization of the American Red Cross; and that is what, in good intentions, we are very likely to do here to-day.

Nobody wants to do that, I know. Nothing could be further from the thought of the Senator from Arkansas, who has offered this amendment, than to wreck the Red Cross; but I say in all sincerity that I truly believe that that will be the effect of his amendment.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Just a moment. I shall be glad to yield a little later; but I desire to expound something more on that thought.

The Red Cross to-day has in its working forces the finest people of this country. All of them work for nothing, and they give their service gladly, and they work long hours, simply because they are happy in the opportunity to be of service. If, however, we are going to make of the Red Cross a bureau of the National Government for spending the national funds it is going to be a mighty short time before those people will back out of it. Then it will become, like all other Government bureaus, peopled with pay-roll employees and headed by bureaucrats, and will become merely a subsidiary branch of the Federal Government for passing out doles to people who claim to be in distress. They will do it with the inefficiency that characterizes almost everything else that we go into on a large scale, with the inefficiency that characterizes the dole system in Great Britain, without one particle of the sympathy and the understanding and the human touch that characterizes the work of the Red Cross to-day. People will be put off by a lot of bureaucratic restrictions, and it will come to be just like our income-tax administration and just like our Veterans' Bureau administration and just like all the rest of the bureaus that we have in Washington.

Nobody wants to see that happen to the Red Cross; and yet that is what we are headed for on the amendment that we are considering.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am not assailing the Red Cross; but does the Senator think \$1.50 a week for eight people is ample for their relief?

Mr. REED. I do not think \$1.50 a week for eight people is ample; no; but perhaps that is all that family needed. Perhaps they have something of their own.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is not the question. That is what is happening. Without anything else, they are trying to feed the people on from 1 to 3 cents a meal. Whether or not that is such a benign influence, for which people ought to thank God, that nobody else will interfere with its administration of charity, I will leave to the Senator; but that is the fact.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. REED. Just a minute. If that is the fact, it is a shocking fact.

Mr. CARAWAY. It is.

Mr. REED. And I can not believe that a man like Mr. Harvey Couch, an Arkansas citizen of highest standing, who has been in charge in that State since Saturday, will stand for that for one minute.

Mr. CARAWAY. There may be a change made; I do not know; but if the Senator would be interested in letters on this subject, I could show him hundreds of them from men of such high character that even the Senator from Pennsylvania could not doubt them. I have some of them lying right here on my desk. I presume—I am inclined to think—that it is because of the scarcity of funds. Even Mr. Myers, one of the agents for the Red Cross, one of their disaster men, said they were supplying and trying to feed people on a dollar a month. He said, "We are letting them go naked. We are letting the women and children go barefooted. We are trying merely to keep life in their bodies. We know that they are suffering." That comes from even the paid organization.

Mr. REED. I am quite unable to understand why the local people who are handling those local cases should go on in that way.

Mr. CARAWAY. They are not going on in that way.

Mr. REED. Yes; they are. They are the people who are giving out the relief.

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, they are giving out whatever is given to them. The Senator, if he will pardon me just a minute, seems to be utterly unable to comprehend the situation that exists in that area. It is hard to believe; I am conscious of that; but these things are bound to happen where every credit resource of a community is stricken down. There is an area in my State larger than Delaware and Rhode Island combined in which there is not a single bank. There is not any credit. If they had credit, that is what they want. They do not want charity.

Mr. REED. I could suggest some ways in which they could get credit and get work. There is \$1,800,000 lying in the Federal Treasury at this minute which Arkansas could have if she would match it and put people to work on her roads.

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes; and there is 4 inches of snow on the ground.

Mr. REED. Presumably it will melt.

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, yes. They will starve, too.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. The organization of the Red Cross is composed and built up out of the local people in the community it is serving. Therefore it is the neighbors of these people who decide the amount of money or the amount of supplies that is necessary to maintain them. If they say that a dollar a week is necessary, it means that these people have other sources of income and other sources from which they are getting supplies.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in that connection?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I think the Senator from New Jersey is entirely mistaken about that. What actually happens is that the Red Cross administers its fund as economically as possible, with no view of rehabilitation. The Red Cross never has made loans to finance crop production. It only feeds the starving; and it habitually does it on as economical a basis as it can be done for reasons that we can all understand. The actual process by which the rations are distributed is through the leadership of the organization, which work it out on a scale that they admit is meager, and which they themselves regard as inadequate. The general ration is admittedly inadequate. It will sustain life, but it is barely sufficient for that purpose.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, we are brought to this situation: The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas would give \$25,000,000 to the Red Cross, and the Red Cross are not asking it at this time. They have their voluntary drive in progress through the Nation, and they want to be let alone to finish it. They think, and most of us think, that to give

this money out of the Federal Treasury to-day will absolutely dry up the springs of private charity, and will make it utterly impossible for them to carry on their drive.

The Senator wants to help the Red Cross. So do I, and we both want to help the Red Cross so that it may help the people who are suffering in the drought areas and other parts of the country. There is no difference in our desire. We both want relief to go to these people. Is it not obviously wise to give them a chance to do what always before they have done successfully—to raise this money by private contribution—and then we, the Federal Government, come to their aid only if it is necessary? All I ask is that they be given three weeks to finish their drive; and then, as I say, if the drive fails, if they can not get enough money by voluntary charity, I shall be one of the first to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

It is not that I am trying to save this money for the Federal Government. God knows, when the March income-tax returns come in, we are going to have a deficit that is going to make us hesitate about spending every cent. We are going to have the worst shock of our lives when we see the personal income-tax returns in March. I am not making this motion with that thought in mind, however. I am not asking to postpone this even as long as March; only the three weeks that is necessary to put over that drive. No matter what the deficit that results, I am ready to vote for the appropriation if the Red Cross needs it; but do not let us give them money for which they are not now asking the Federal Government, and which they say and we think will absolutely ruin the integrity of the Red Cross for the future.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BROOKHART. With reference to these taxes, I notice by newspaper reports that the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and the public utilities generally of the United States have had the biggest return, taken the biggest earnings from the people during 1930, this year of depression, of any year in their history. Under that situation, do not they and Mr. Mellon and Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Morgan, the men that take these excess profits in these times, owe it to these people to furnish this relief; and is it not our duty to levy the tax and collect the debt?

Mr. REED. When we get the income-tax returns we will discover that the people who have made great profits in 1930 are very, very few and far between. If they made the profits, they will have to pay their surtax; but there are not going to be very many of them and it is not long to wait. It is only about eight weeks now, and we will see whether or not the prophecy is accurate; but I venture to say that the returns of individual income-tax payers in March will be the lowest that we have known since the early days when the income tax was established.

Mr. BROOKHART. How about the big combinations that I have mentioned?

Mr. REED. Let us quit trying to level off wealth and impoverish the rich man for just a little while, and confine ourselves to this question of relief of people who are suffering. I will debate the Senator's theories of equalization of wealth with him as long as he would like, and we will discuss Wall Street all day some time; but let us not do it to-day because it is not quite relevant to this discussion.

Mr. BROOKHART. One other question: The Senator, the other day, when we were sinking \$30,000,000 into this battleship rat hole, mentioned the tribute that Pennsylvania was paying to Iowa.

Mr. REED. I did not say "Pennsylvania."

Mr. BROOKHART. Well, the tribute that the country at large was paying to the farmers of Iowa. I desire to call his attention to the fact that in this leveling of wealth these same big combinations have leveled some four or five billion dollars out of the wealth of Iowa since 1920.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I have said all I care to say about the matter. The committee which is announced to-day includes such men as Calvin Coolidge, Alfred E. Smith, John W. Davis, John J. Pershing, and a great list of distinguished

Americans who have lent their names to the committee that has the Red Cross drive in charge. If they can not raise the fund by three weeks from to-day, then let us have the Federal Government make it up. If they can raise the fund, it is infinitely better that it should be raised in that way. For that reason I have made the motion that the question go over until February 9.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, it is a little difficult to be patient with a proposition not to do something; to refuse to act; to delay until the 9th of February extending succor to barefooted and hungry and actually starving men, women, and children. Of course, it is not worth while to say it, but that is "playing politics with human misery." It is an attempt of the administration to save its face. It is an attempt to alibi the failure of the administration and the Red Cross adequately to meet the situation until the crying out of the hungry can be heard above the crack of the party lash.

I have two news items. They were poor. They were unknown. One of them is from a little town on White River, Ark., to the effect that—

Bill Connor, 70 years old, minus both legs and destitute, died here Thursday afternoon as the result of exposure. He was found unconscious by the roadside the day before and was brought here and given food and medical attention, but could not survive.

He said he lost his legs in a storm years ago, and that he was reared near Lonoke.

The remainder of the clipping said the real cause of his death was starvation. I have another clipping from McCrory, with reference to Charles Gunlock, who was found in a dying condition Thursday afternoon in his little hut on the Cache River, where he was engaged in his usual occupation of fishing and trapping. It was discovered that he was dying of hunger.

I have innumerable letters disclosing the fact that school children are being given one meal a day and are living on it—little school children! The Red Cross is supplying the needs of the whole family with \$1 for two weeks where the family does not exceed five in number, and where it is in excess of that number it gives them \$1.50 every two weeks.

There are thousands of cases where the Red Cross is not supplying any relief. I do not know whether it has the funds to relieve the situation or not. Mr. Payne has made two statements. One was that they had ample funds, that there was no suffering and that everybody was being amply cared for. Then in a few days he reversed himself and told the American people that the greatest crisis that ever confronted this people in times of peace now faces us, and asked that \$10,000,000 be raised. We are told that the Red Cross can not raise \$10,000,000 while Congress offers to supply relief. Then for God's sake, let us not allow people to starve between the two plans. If the Red Cross can not raise the funds and says it can not—and the statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] seems to bear out that—let us not hesitate, but give them relief from this source.

No one down in my State—and my colleague and I are both well aware of it—wants charity. We have lots of poor people, but they wanted to preserve their lives and their self respect if they might be allowed to do so. We asked that they might be permitted to borrow and were refused. That was killed by the influence of the administration. The pending proposition now comes before the Senate, but not at the request of our people. They would rather have been allowed to borrow and to pay even exorbitant interest rather than to have to apply for charity. Lots of them will suffer before they will accept it. But this proposal is the only thing now before the Congress. We have to have it or get nothing.

I do not like to quibble about these matters. It is recognized by the President of the United States and even John Barton Payne has waked up to a realization of the fact that there is distress, that there is starvation, that there are inadequate funds to take care of the situation. Now what is the administration and what is Congress to do in response to that acknowledged situation? Are we to postpone relief until February 9 and in the meantime pass the appropriation bill so that the administration can laugh at our misery. "Any special bill granting relief will be vetoed by the adminis-

tration," and we do not hope to have votes enough to pass such a measure over the veto of the President as long as they can play in another branch of Congress with every such measure sent there. As long as "Amos 'n' Andy" find it more amusing and more diverting to argue about who owns an official car than to pass legislation which will keep women and children from starving, of course we can not expect serious consideration of measures to relieve human suffering.

If this proposed plan of relief is postponed until the 9th of February we will not get a dollar. I am not going to pretend that I believe that it is intended that we shall ever get a dollar out of it. I know we are not to do so. I know the appropriation bills will be whipped through the Congress. I know there will be no other measure pending to which this or a similar amendment may be attached which the President will not be willing to see die and therefore will veto immediately—playing politics, Mr. President, with human misery.

I did intend to discuss the situation in Arkansas and other drought-stricken States as it has been revealed to me, but I see no occasion to do so, since we now know what is the plan of the administration and we stand face to face with it. It is not a denial that suffering exists, that starvation is rampant, that there are hundreds of thousands of American citizens who are dying because of a lack of the necessities of life, but a negation of relief unless Congress do something. The condition is not denied now, but we are asked to delay for nearly a month while the administration experiments with whether or not charitably inclined people will amply take care of the situation.

I do not know and I am not going to argue about where the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] gets his information about the situation that exists in Arkansas and how adequately the necessity of the people are being cared for. I know whatever the source of his information is that it is as utterly unreliable as is his philosophy of human want and human nature.

I have here a letter, all of which I shall not read. It is written by a brother of my colleague, a gentleman who is at the head of the Red Cross in Lonoke County. Everybody who knows him will accept his statement as conclusive of whatever facts he verifies. I shall leave out the personal part of the letter and read as follows:

To see the streets lined with ragged, half-starved people, who have no means of support and who can not get any work at all, is one of the few things that make us ashamed of our civilization or pretended civilization. I am at the head of the Red Cross relief of this county, being the chairman, and I have been literally swamped every day with from 30 to 50 applicants for relief. You know that I am familiar with all the people of this county. Their condition is beyond description. The owners of farms received no rent from their lands and the renters could not pay their supply bill, so there is scarcely a farmer able to supply his starving tenants with food. The stores and banks are all broken and the county is also broken, so that the poor which it was supporting are now all thrown on the Red Cross. The teachers of the State are working without salary. Not one cent has been paid to the teachers in this county since their November checks. All of December and so far in January they have worked without any salary and the way it looks now no taxes will be paid this year, and you see the schools will all have to close.

Omitting some more of the personal portions of the letter, I read further:

I have for the last month looked into the faces of hundreds of men out of whom had fled every vestige of hope. Strong men, who have all their lives stood firm in the confidence of self-support, have broken down. Even in our native hills the once independent citizens can find no means of support and no hope for the future. Their once-filled cribs are empty. They are without the usual fruits. Barren fields and falling orchards are everywhere. There is to-day not one of the strong men of the hills left. They have borrowed until their homes are mortgaged and even their stock heavily encumbered.

Then he discusses the England situation:

The case of England, about which there was so much talk, was as follows: The committee ran out of blank applications, and that lasted for three days, so the crowd was three times as large as it otherwise would have been. If the blanks had not run out, there would have been no trouble. We are, at Lonoke, issuing from 30 to 50 application blanks each and every day, and no trouble has arisen. You will find no trouble in the county, for they have all learned to keep plenty of blank applications; and unless the Red Cross runs out of funds, which is very likely to happen, there will

be no trouble. But the Red Cross will have to supply the people for three more months, January, February, and March, until the owners can get their supplies to run their tenants.

The banks are all broken here, and I can not see how the owners are going to supply their tenants, especially since there is not a single farmer in the county who was able to pay his last year's supply bill. If cotton, the only money crop here, falls in price as well as in quantity, as it did last year, God Himself can not solve the problem then. It looks to me now that the price of this product is likely to be, as last year, below the cost of production. Let us hope that food supplies, corn, fruit, potatoes, etc., may be supplied.

I will omit the rest of the letter, which is of a personal nature.

That is the situation, Mr. President. I have a letter here from a man—I do not indorse the heat which he puts in his charge, although I appreciate the reason for it—who says:

As a hundred per cent American, I wish to protest against the niggardly policy of the American Red Cross in this drought-relief work. One of my neighbors was allotted the munificent sum of \$3.50 to feed a family of 13 for two weeks. That is an average of one and twelve-thirtieths cents per day for each day.

Then he cites many other cases of equally "well relieved" families who are suffering for the necessities of life.

Possibly, Mr. President, the Red Cross did not realize the situation; I know that Judge Payne did not, and he does not now.

I had intended to incorporate in the RECORD a number of letters to me and to the National Red Cross, but I am going merely to incorporate two. Mr. M. L. Sigman, a business man of large experience, a man whose heart is as tender as that of a woman, sent a telegram and also wrote a letter to Mr. Payne, both of which I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD. I will say that Mr. Sigman is the head of the Red Cross in Drew County, Ark., and therefore knows the situation and knows what is being done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the telegram and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The telegram and letter are as follows:

MONTICELLO, ARK., January 8, 1931.

JOHN BARTON PAYNE,
Chairman American National Red Cross,
Washington, D. C.:

Read with interest yesterday's press your opposition to Caraway bill for food relief. Appreciate your stand as applicable to destitution in cities and towns dependent on industry. Am of opinion would be mistake for Red Cross to carry on through the year in farmers' relief, especially if provision can be made for them in any other manner. Under the bill the same machinery the Government will set up for feed and seed loans can without further expense administer food loan to same party, the same security controlling in both. In majority of cases here feed and seed loans would be useless unless food is also provided. A careful survey will justify this statement.

M. L. SIGMAN,
Chairman Drew County Chapter American Red Cross.

AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS,
DREW COUNTY CHAPTER,
Monticello, Ark., January 8, 1931.

Mr. JOHN BARTON PAYNE, Chairman,
American National Red Cross, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PAYNE: I am inclosing herewith copy of telegram which I have to-day wired you, and in connection beg to advise that due to the great financial depression existing in this part of the county, all of which you are already aware, it makes it impossible for a large portion of our farming people to obtain credit necessary to enable them to make another crop. As I understand the set-up for the farm relief under the bill already passed, we can use for feed and seed only, and in order to secure this the farmers will have to mortgage their growing crops, leaving them no collateral or means whatever to secure a loan for food. You can readily see that this type of farm feed and seed loan would be valueless.

Noting your opposition to Senator CARAWAY's bill providing for \$15,000,000 funds for food and loans in connection with the above-mentioned bill is the cause of my writing you, and I hope that since the article yesterday you have given this matter your careful consideration and will support the bill of Senator CARAWAY.

You are no doubt correct as far as those dependent on industry for a living is concerned, but in my candid opinion if the Red Cross undertakes to provide food for the destitution of agriculture in this part of the country it will develop in a much greater job than they anticipated and will have to carry on continuously until the last of July at least. This will not only work a hardship on the Red Cross but on the farmers themselves, in that they will lose a great deal of time coming in and qualifying for Red

Cross aid, and it will at the same time destroy their independence in trying to provide for themselves.

I have been continuously in the work here since the war, and, of course, I am writing you as I see the situation from a local standpoint; but my observation is that the same conditions prevail all over the entire Cotton Belt in the drought area.

Please be assured, Mr. Payne, that it is a pleasure to work with your organization and that the best interest of humanity prompts this letter.

With very kindest regards, I am, yours very truly,

M. L. SIGMAN,

Chairman Drew County Chapter American Red Cross.

Mr. CARAWAY. As I said a moment ago, Mr. President, I had intended to speak at considerable length about this situation, but I feel too strongly about it to do so. It is enough that people are left to starve, let alone their being insulted by the political play that is now attempting to enmesh this relief measure.

Mr. President, we know why former Governor Smith, of New York, John W. Davis, and Owen D. Young were named as members of the committee to secure funds for the Red Cross. We know why the former President of the United States, Mr. Coolidge, has been selected. We know why this set-up was made yesterday afternoon. Like the first announcement of the \$10,000,000 Red Cross drive, it came on the eve of forcing a vote in the House of Representatives, in order to give to those who are standing with the administration and against the relief of human suffering the courage to go through with the program of the White House. As any simpleton in America knows this set-up last night was announced on the eve of the motion made by the Senator from Pennsylvania this morning to postpone action on the pending amendment. The announcement was made for political effect. It is not expected that it will add a dollar to the Red Cross drive; the set-up was not made with that in view, but it was made to give some Members of the Senate the courage to stand against the cry for relief that is coming up from suffering humanity in 21 States of the Union. It may have its effect, Mr. President, but the man who heeds it must part with his self-respect; he can not retain it and support such a partisan play, such a political play, such an effort to "play politics with human misery."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, with every possible practical purpose to relieve the distress which the Senator from Arkansas so eloquently describes, I rise to sustain the position taken by the Senator from Pennsylvania, believing that under candid analysis there is no shadow of ultimate doubt that the greatest measure of actual relief that can actually reach drought sufferers will come through the program which he defines.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senate is on the threshold of a supremely important decision. It is important, first, because when any members of the American family are suffering in the grip of disaster it is the primary business of the other American people to relieve them. It is important, secondly, because traditional methods of relief, methods peculiarly and particularly American, can not be usefully superseded unless and until they have broken down and are a prospective failure. Both these questions are now at the Senate's bar and they interlock.

Let there be no misunderstanding as to the relative emphasis which I would put upon these two questions. I am ready to vote for the relief of human suffering in the United States by the best and surest and swiftest route, and without any arbitrary immunity for the Treasury of the United States whatsoever. I should have no patience with an academic quarrel over methods which would delay actual relief by a single hour; but it is not academic in the present emergency to discuss methods of relief, because the quickest relief will continue to come if the contemporary Red Cross drive be not hampered or interrupted, and if it may swiftly succeed. It is not academic to avoid, if possible, a parliamentary deadlock, which, while discouraging the success of the Red Cross drive for private relief funds, will postpone, perhaps indefinitely, the release of any public funds to take their place. You can not feed starving people on a parliamentary impasse.

We confront a condition and not a theory. Not in a spirit of controversy, Mr. President, but certainly in a spirit of anxiety to aid the stricken victims of drought for whom the able Senators from Arkansas so eloquently plead, I want briefly to analyze this condition which, I say, we confront as distinguished from a theory.

Here is a ravished sector of the country which requires and deserves adequate relief over a large area upon a large scale. No one can get from me any dissent to the oft-repeated axiom that we must be as generous with our own folk as we have been with foreign peoples in like or less distress. Relief there must be, and if it threatens to fail by one method, then I am ready to embrace another method, and not even the hostile cry of "dole" can stop me at that juncture. But is it not the fact, Mr. President, that we have already embarked upon one method, our usual American method for campaigns of sustained relief—the method of a voluntarily financed Red Cross? The Red Cross never yet has disappointed or failed the beneficiaries of its neighborly relief; that is an indisputable fact. There is as yet no sound reason to anticipate its failure in the drought crisis. The American people never yet have failed adequately to finance the Red Cross in these emergencies. There is as yet no adequate reason to anticipate failure in the present plea, particularly in view of the new stimulus, the fresh impetus given that plea by the distinguished Americans who, at the President's instance, enlisted this morning in this great humanitarian crusade.

Mr. President, if the drive succeeds, drought-relief needs are answered precisely as the flood-relief needs were satisfactorily answered in the same territory two or three years ago. The drive for this purpose is under way. The best interests of the drought-relief sufferers lie in the success of that drive. Therefore, the best service we at the moment can render these sufferers is to give this drive the right of way and wholly encourage its success. To hamper its success is to jeopardize relief. Certainly we hamper it if we now pretend to offer to substitute public for private funds, when instead we are merely offering a parliamentary deadlock, and certainly we not only jeopardize relief but also actually withdraw relief if our substitute results only in such a deadlock with the other House or with the Executive. That, indeed, would be giving a stone where bread is asked. In the name of swift and real relief, I beg of Senators to look these facts in the face.

Mr. President, if the Red Cross drive fails, which is the other alternative, an alternative to which we have not as yet come—if the Red Cross drive fails or gives evidence of failure within the fortnight, then we must embrace the alternative; we must embrace any alternative, because I heartily agree with Senators upon the other side, and I heartily agree with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania in his statement this morning, that in the face of that proven fact, namely, the fact of the failure of this drive, there is absolutely no excuse for a moment's hesitation in this Chamber or anywhere else to provide any essential relief out of the Public Treasury. In this situation I make that pledge for myself here and now.

Mr. President, the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania proposes that we shall wait two or three weeks and then decide. If this interim threatened a single hour of famine that might otherwise be averted I should oppose it, but the sheer logic of the situation forces the conclusion, in all candor, that the delay in our action as proposed by the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania not only is no liability but it actually is calculated to be an asset for the sufferers for whom relief is sought. Why? First, because the Red Cross already has in hand ample funds to finance drought relief for much more than two or three weeks. In other words, any new funds, from whatever source, would not be expended until there is ample time for us to act after this moratorium; in other words, there is no immediate menace by allowing two or three weeks to elapse.

Second, because the success of the Red Cross drive immediately and happily closes all argument and provides necessary relief, which I assume is what we all desire.

Third, because—

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me there?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to his colleague?

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me to complete the reasons, then I will be delighted to yield.

Third, because any present Senate action by way of direct appropriations inevitably hampers the success of the Red Cross drive, and without any assurance of substitute relief, since the present prospect, repeatedly referred to upon this floor, is that we run only into a parliamentary deadlock when we embrace the substitute.

Fourth, because on February 9—the date proposed for a decision under the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania—if the Red Cross drive has failed, there can be and there will be practically no opposition upon this floor to the substitute, and because the interim meanwhile is absolutely adequately financed. In other words, the delay does not threaten a single drought sufferer in a single instance. On the contrary, it is an asset to those who—myself among them—would seek to serve these sufferers. It is an asset, because in the ultimate net result it absolutely guarantees that these sufferers will be relieved, if not by private, then by public funds. What they want is relief, not mere sterile gestures.

I now yield to my colleague.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, the Senator has in part answered the apparent contradiction that I thought he was making, and that is, if there is a parliamentary deadlock now, it is obvious to me that it will be equally so on February 9. If there is not a parliamentary deadlock on February 9, I can see no reason for any private individual subscribing between now and February 9 if the theory of the Senator is correct.

In other words, I have already made my contribution, so I am not talking about myself; but if what the Senator promises is correct—that there will be no parliamentary deadlock on February 9—then what on earth is the reason for contributing between now and February 9, if the Senator promises that the legislation will be passed on that date?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am very glad the Senator has asked me the question. I think there is a very definite and specific and conclusive answer to it. The answer is that we have put those of the American people who believe in voluntary charity upon their mettle to make good between now and February 9, and, in my judgment, the situation that has been created here will act as the greatest stimulant that any Red Cross drive ever had in the history of the United States; and when we confront the date named in the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania there will be no crisis left. The money will be in the box and the relief will be adequately under way. Those who believe in voluntary philanthropy as the genius of the Red Cross will see to it that this occurs.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator and some others can speak for this side of the legislative body, perhaps; but is there any reasonable assurance that we will not meet with a deadlock elsewhere upon the 9th of February?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, of course I can not speak for any other branch of the Government; but I should say that no power on earth could prevent prompt and effectual action in the joint bodies of the Congress in the face of proven Red Cross failure.

Mr. COUZENS, Mr. BORAH, and Mr. BROOKHART addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. COUZENS. I was going to say that the Senator has some assurance that I have not received that the leaders on the other side will not be strong enough and indifferent enough to block legislation, if they so choose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am relying upon the sheer force of the unanswerable logic of the situation which we shall confront on the 9th of February if there is left any lack whatever in adequate relief for these drought sufferers.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator from Pennsylvania and others have taken the position that the pendency of this amendment, even though they assert that a deadlock as to its final enactment will result, will hamper the Red Cross drive and endanger the Red Cross organization. Have they thought of the inconsistency of their own position, so plainly apparent on their statements that one can not refrain from wondering why they take the position that the amendment should be postponed with the assurance that if the drive should fail the appropriation would be made; that they would then vote for it just as eagerly and just as enthusiastically as any Senator in the Chamber? Will not the assurance that the amendment will finally prevail just as much discourage the Red Cross drive as its passage now, under the circumstances they have described; and will it not result in the postponement of relief, when the one thing that is causing anxiety is that there should be immediate action assuring adequate relief?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think the situation is totally different. I think that congressional relief, which is contingent upon the demonstrated failure of private philanthropy, is a totally different thing from a present warranty of an underwritten Red Cross fund. In the one instance we challenge private philanthropy to do its traditionally useful Red Cross job, and give it a brief time in which to qualify. In the other instance we issue a quitclaim deed to private philanthropy and virtually dismiss it from its tasks.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield for a question. I prefer to have the Senator make his argument in his own time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I can not make clear to the Senator in a question just the thought that I wish to express.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sure I understand the Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. But if he prefers to yield only for a question, I will state the matter in the form of a question.

Is it not true that the Senator has expressed himself as being profoundly in sympathy with the appropriation if the drive should fail; and does it not follow that those who would like to escape contributions would rely on the assurance they have been given by the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Michigan that the amendment will finally prevail if they withhold their contributions?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Now, let me answer the Senator.

Those who are hunting for an excuse to escape a contribution to the Red Cross drive may be encouraged precisely as the Senator from Arkansas indicates; but, in my humble judgment, there is in the United States a powerful, formidable body of opinion which so thoroughly believes in retaining private philanthropy behind the Red Cross, and thus to protect the beautiful and precious genius of the Red Cross, that this situation becomes a challenge to them which will be accepted with a demonstration of response that will be absolutely final in its measure of adequacy.

That is the only answer I can give to the Senator. I think the situations are totally different.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not want to vote for this appropriation if there is any reasonable, just ground to be-

lieve that the situation is going to be taken care of by voluntary organization; but the attitude of those who are opposing it has taken a change this morning, and if that attitude extends throughout and includes the other House it would have great weight with me.

Heretofore the appropriation has been fought on the ground that it was a bad precedent; that we were establishing a dole; that the Congress ought not to interfere. That is the basis of practically all the editorials in opposition to it. That has been the basis of the administration in opposition to it. That has been the basis of the argument here.

This morning, however, I understand that there is no trouble about the precedent; that there is no hesitation about the dole system, if it is necessary. It is urged, however, that we should not do this at this time because it will be, in effect, loading upon the farmers an additional burden to carry in the way of a mortgage, and therefore that we ought not to proceed as we are now proceeding. Does that extend to the other House?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator has asked me a rather complicated and involved question, and he will have to suffer me to make an answer in kind.

Mr. BORAH. I will suffer.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me—

Mr. VANDENBERG. Just a moment, please.

Mr. REED. Merely to say that I did not advance any such argument as that, and I have not heard it advanced by anybody else.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, of course I would not undertake for a moment to speak for the President of the United States, and I am not assuming for a moment to reflect his attitude. I have said nothing whatever about loans to farmers. I am basing the position I take solely upon the unanswerable logic of the situation, as we shall create it, in the situation as I have described it. I am speaking of the way to get relief to these sufferers.

Mr. COUZENS and Mr. NORRIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, I desire to call my colleague's attention to a statement made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], on which the Senator from Idaho based his recent statement. The Senator from Pennsylvania said that we should not advance money to the farmers in the form of a loan to buy food because it would affect the Government's lien on the crop. The Senator made that statement, and it is in the RECORD.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania for a moment, and then I yield to no one for the time being.

Mr. REED. Evidently these Senators did not hear all that I said. I started by explaining why it would have been unwise to put the word "food" in the bill which we passed, and which was signed on December 20, because that provided for loans which were liens on the crops. I said that if there was distress that required food, the way to give it was to give it outright, and not lend money for food which would be a lien on the growing crops. I was talking then about the bill which has been passed and signed by the President. That had nothing whatever to do with this case.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Just a minute. Everybody is agreed that the Red Cross ought to give this money. It ought not to lend it; it ought to give it. The only question before us now is whether public money or private money should go to the Red Cross.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, just a minute. I do not want to be diverted into a discussion of farm loans or drought loans at this particular time.

Mr. BORAH. I only want to say that I accept the Senator's explanation of the matter. I shall have something to say about it later.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I want to proceed on the fundamental theory which, in my judgment, supports the position I take.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands the Senator from Michigan to refuse to be dispossessed of the floor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. For the time being, the Chair correctly states the Senator's position.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should prefer not to yield for a moment. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator a little later.

Let us take a typical city, Mr. President, and see what the precise reaction is and whether or not it sustains in any degree the position that I take.

On last Friday I sent telegrams to perhaps 15 Michigan cities and inquired the status of the Red Cross drive. Some of these responses were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD upon Saturday. Some of those responses frankly said, "We think we can not raise the money, and we think there ought to be a supplemental legislative appropriation from the Federal Treasury." Others asked earnestly for time in which to rally local supporters of the Red Cross to its historic reliance upon generous volunteers.

This morning I have an answer from a distinguished citizen of Detroit which rather summarizes the picture as I see it and sustains the logic of the situation as I am attempting to sustain it.

I asked the question to which I have referred of Mr. Frank W. Blair, of Detroit, who is a distinguished banker, a public-spirited citizen, a sound thinker, and a man who has had large experience in communal philanthropy. This is what Mr. Blair says of the situation in Detroit:

We do not believe Detroit chapter can secure the quota set.

His first statement is a frank acknowledgment that under the situation as it existed upon last Friday or Saturday he feels that the full Detroit quota can not be met.

A newspaper appeal to the general public will be made, and a letter appealing to several hundred wealthy and well-to-do. There is no question but that the prospect of Government aid affects public mind toward subscribing in these times of diminishing incomes.

There is a statement of the effect thus far of the agitation for the substitution of public for private funds, and I think it is no stretch of logic to connect this statement, at least in part, with the original statement of a possible doubt respecting the net result. I continue reading:

The Detroit chapter is divided in opinion regarding departure from traditional Red Cross policy of depending on popular subscription, but we agree that after we have secured what we can by popular appeal, if this amount were inadequate we should accept and use Government funds.

Mr. President, that is precisely my position. I would amplify it, however, to the extent of expressing the belief that if the quest for public funds be given the suspended status proposed by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania it will become possible for Detroit and these other Michigan communities to meet their quotas.

Let me, for the sake of sustaining this position, quote from one or two other Michigan telegrams. Here is one from the mayor of Detroit, Mayor Murphy, who says:

We want to be helpful and will do everything we can, but Detroit is hard hit, and the prospects are poor.

There is a statement of the economic fact that it is exceedingly difficult for this great magic city of the Middle West to respond to this drive. Yet here is an expression of complete desire and willingness to be helpful to the maximum, and in my judgment these communities will be helpful to the maximum, in the face of the challenge which the Senator from Pennsylvania is seeking to create.

Let me go to the upper peninsula of Michigan, which, economically speaking, probably is as hard hit a sector as there is in the whole United States. Let me go to the heart

of the copper country, where industry is practically stagnant and where the situation is just as gloomy as it possibly can be in any corner of this land. Let me read the response of another distinguished and representative citizen, Mr. Albert E. Peterman, who can speak with some authority for the citizens of Calumet and vicinity. This is his brave response to my inquiry, a response, let me remind the Senate again, coming out of the heart of as deeply depressed a section of this country as there is. I read the telegram:

From such information available, I think local chapters can easily raise quotas. Many have sufficient funds in their treasuries to meet this call without further solicitation. Red Cross ability to meet such emergencies through voluntary contributions, and without tapping Public Treasury, has been the chief factor in its past success. There is no reason to believe its customary methods will fail now, and I believe appropriation at present to be unfair, ill-advised, and weakening precedent.

Mr. President, that is the frank statement of the opinion of a distinguished citizen, who is prepared, in the face of tremendous local difficulty, to carry on in behalf of this challenge which has been laid at the bar of the country by the President of the United States.

I can not escape the conclusion, I repeat again and again, that when the country understands that it has a brief interval in which to prove that the standard method of voluntarily financing Red Cross drives has to justify its existence, there will be no doubt about the net result. If there is a failure at the end of the brief period which the Senator from Pennsylvania has fixed, if there is a failure at that time, then there will be no escape, not only in humanity but in sheer logic, from precisely such action as the Senator from Arkansas has suggested, and there is no doubt, I repeat, in my own mind that the response of the Congress would be overwhelming and conclusive upon that score.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to his colleague?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. COUZENS. Does the Senator conceive that \$10,000,000 would be enough?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have no idea whether that will be enough. The Senator from Arkansas apparently thought originally that \$15,000,000 would be enough, in the form of loans. If the Red Cross \$10,000,000 is not enough, plus the \$5,000,000 already appropriated by the Red Cross, then a subsequent drive, of course, in the natural process, will have to be made.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly.

Mr. COUZENS. Then, of course, Congress will be in recess, and we can not possibly get any Government appropriation. In other words, it seems to me that this is an attempt to drive over the period when Congress will be in session, and be compelled either to get private subscriptions or to let the people in the stricken sections starve to death.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sure the Senator is not trying to find that motive in my attitude.

Mr. COUZENS. Oh, no. I think that is one of the motives back of the drive to postpone consideration of this matter until February 9, and then, if the \$10,000,000 has been raised, as my colleague believes it will be, along about March 1 to 15, when more money is wanted, private charity will have to subscribe, because Congress will not be in session to make an appropriation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me state to the Senate why I disagree with that analysis.

I think there is a widespread and profound and deeply conscientious body of thought in the United States which believes in two doctrines: First, the doctrine of local self-reliance and local self-sufficiency in the face of disaster; second, the doctrine of privately sustained philanthropy as opposed to tax-supported philanthropy. I think that feeling in defense of these two doctrines is so deep-rooted, so traditional, so acute that it amply explains why men should feel deeply upon the pending proposition and should have

undertaken precisely the movement visualized in the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Not only is that a contemporary feeling but it is an historic feeling in the United States, and while I have no desire at the moment to turn backward for credentials, I do think it is worth while for me to read two paragraphs from another presidential message upon precisely the same fundamental point, as delivered by another Executive in the history of the United States who was not worried when he made the statement I am about to read about an extra session, and who was not seeking to gerrymander any appropriation but who was discussing the profound conviction of his heart respecting the necessities in the maintenance of the genius of American institutions. I want to read these paragraphs from the Executive message of Grover Cleveland on February 16, 1887. He was vetoing an act to make a special distribution of seeds in the drought-stricken counties of Texas. I commend these words to the thoughtful consideration of the Senate respecting the serious problem of the President which is involved in the action we are asked to take. Said President Cleveland:

I feel obliged to withhold my approval of the plan, as proposed by this bill, to indulge a benevolent and charitable sentiment through the appropriation of public funds for that purpose.

I can find no warrant for such an appropriation in the Constitution, and I do not believe that the power and duty of the General Government ought to be extended to the relief of individual suffering which is in no manner properly related to the public service or benefit. A prevalent tendency to disregard the limited mission of this power and duty should, I think, be steadfastly resisted, to the end that the lesson should be constantly enforced that though the people support the Government the Government should not support the people.

The friendliness and charity of our countrymen can always be relied upon to relieve their fellow citizens in misfortune. This has been repeatedly and quite lately demonstrated. Federal aid in such cases encourages the expectation of paternal care on the part of the Government and weakens the sturdiness of our national character, while it prevents the indulgence among our people of that kindly sentiment and conduct which strengthens the bonds of a common brotherhood.

Mr. President, when Mr. Cleveland uttered those sentiments, he was facing no conspiracy of events such as that to which my colleague directed my attention a few moments ago. He was dealing with the fundamental principle. I do not follow him to the extent he went in this message. If I did follow him to that extent, I probably could not have voted for the seed loans, for which I did vote. Certainly I could not have voted for the food loan, for which I also did vote. But here is a warning against the inherent menace in the substitution of tax-supported philanthropy for private philanthropy, and I am submitting it solely to show that a disposition of this character may be held, and held profoundly, entirely independently of the particular situation with which we are now dealing.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BROOKHART addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish merely to inquire if that is not the same sort of legislation as that which President Hoover signed a few days ago?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think it is, Mr. President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Has not the Senator from Michigan already announced that he was going to waive all that, however, on February 9?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I stated specifically that I depart from Mr. Cleveland's philosophy if and when his philosophy has demonstrated that it is impotent and sterile, but I decline to depart until that proof is in hand. It seems to me that the infirmity, the unwitting infirmity, of the amendment submitted by the able senior Senator from Arkansas is that it is not contingent upon the failure of these two fundamental doctrines. When those doctrines fail, I will march with the Senator just as enthusiastically as he does in behalf of the precise relief he seeks.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the Senator's position. He has already departed in part from President Cleveland's

dictum when he voted for the seed law, and on the 9th of February he is willing to depart entirely.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator may quibble over the exhibit I have presented in any fashion he sees fit. I have presented it in all seriousness, not as a complete reflection of my attitude, but as proof, I repeat, of the fact that there is a fundamental, traditional feeling upon this proposition in the story of the United States, and that it is not a mere temporary and passing expedient which is being embraced at the moment by the Senator from Pennsylvania or by myself, or by the President of the United States.

Mr. COPELAND and Mr. NORRIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator has just said that he is not speaking his own attitude. I assume, then, he is speaking that of the administration.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator has heard my attempt to analyze the situation, he understands precisely for whom I am speaking. I am speaking for myself alone, and I am speaking out of a very great earnestness, and out of a very serious desire to facilitate the most practical and the swiftest possible aid for the drought sufferers of the South. I am trying to avoid fruitless action here in the Senate to-day—action which will be helpful to no one, least of all to the victims of the drought.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator has made a strong argument. It would make it very much stronger if he would now assure the Senate, if this matter is deferred for two weeks, that when we pass the relief bill then it will receive the signature of the President.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator, of course, is asking me for an assurance I can not give him and could not undertake to give him.

I yield now to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, in the interest of saving time, in which effort I want to join with the Senator, I ask if he will not yield to me at this time for the purpose of making a point of order against the pending motion, which, if sustained, will hurry us along to quite an extent?

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me, I will conclude in a moment, and then the Senator can take the floor in his own time. Even if a point of order be sustained against the motion of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, the course of action for which I plead remains obvious and clear. I shall vote against direct Federal contribution for the Red Cross unless and until, within a reasonable time, the Red Cross unexpectedly and for the first time in its history fails to function.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. FESS. Just to show how far we have moved since 1887, when President Cleveland issued his message to which the Senator refers, I wonder if the Senator will permit me to have the entire message printed at the conclusion of his remarks?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have no objection.

Mr. FESS. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Michigan there may be printed in the RECORD the message of President Cleveland of February 16, 1887.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit A at the conclusion of Mr. VANDENBERG's remarks.)

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am not particularly interested in what happened in 1887. I am interested in what is happening in 1931 in the drought areas. I am persuaded beyond any shadow of a doubt that the quickest relief that can reach the drought area is by the process proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]

because under that process the Red Cross funds will not be dried up. On the contrary, they will be forthcoming, and meanwhile we shall not have pretended to substitute a public contribution which, as most of us here know, will be beset all the way with parliamentary difficulties which probably will result in no utility for some time to come.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I ask unanimous consent to print as part of these observations the statement issued this morning by the President of the United States concerning the function of the advisory relief committee which he has appointed and the personnel thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

[From the New York Times, January 19, 1931]

TEXT OF THE PRESIDENT'S LETTER TO 57 LEADERS ASKING THEIR ASSISTANCE IN RED CROSS DRIVE

The President's letter to those whom he asked to serve on a nation-wide committee to aid the Red Cross drive read as follows:

"I am appointing a nation-wide committee to sponsor the American Red Cross effort to raise \$10,000,000 for the relief of the sufferers in the drought-stricken areas. Mr. Coolidge has consented to act as honorary chairman. Knowing your public spirit, I am most desirous that you should be a member of this committee.

"We are faced with a national emergency. Those in need in our larger cities are being and will be provided for through the generosity and self-reliance of the citizens of those communities. The people, however, in the drought-stricken areas in 21 States are not in a position adequately to help themselves and must look to their fellow citizens for temporary assistance.

"The American way of meeting such a relief problem has been through a voluntary effort, and for many years this effort has been concentrated in the American Red Cross, created by the people themselves to act in just such emergencies. It has met its responsibilities magnificently in times of war and of peace.

"It is essential that we should maintain the sound American tradition and a spirit of voluntary aid in such emergency and should not undermine that spirit which has made our Red Cross the outstanding guardian of our people in time of disaster.

"HERBERT HOOVER."

The statement said that acceptances had been received from the following:

Hon. Calvin Coolidge, honorary chairman.
Hon. John Barton Payne, chairman.
Hon. Alfred E. Smith, vice chairman.
Hon. John W. Davis, vice chairman.
Gen. John J. Pershing, vice chairman.
Gen. Abel Davis, vice chairman, president of the Chicago Title & Trust Co.
William E. Boeing, Seattle, Wash., aircraft manufacturer.
William Butler Worth, Moline, Ill., president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.
The Rev. S. Parkes Cadman, pastor of the Central Congregational Church, of Brooklyn, N. Y.
Herbert J. Case, New York, chairman of the board of the New York Federal Reserve Bank.
Winthrop Murray Crane, jr., Dalton, Mass., paper manufacturer.
William H. Crocker, San Francisco, Calif., banker and member of the Republican National Committee.
George Howard Crosby, Duluth, Minn., owner of iron mines.
Harvey C. Couch, Pine Bluff, Ark., State chairman of the Red Cross relief for Arkansas.
Charles I. Denechaud, New Orleans, La., lawyer, chairman of the civil relief of the New Orleans chapter of the Red Cross.
Charles Donnelly, St. Paul, Minn., president of the Northern Pacific Railroad Co.
George Eastman, Rochester, N. Y., kodak manufacturer.
Howard W. Fenton, Chicago, banker.
Herbert Fleishhacker, San Francisco, banker and civic leader.
William Fortune, Indianapolis, Ind., life member of the general board of incorporators of the American Red Cross.
The Right Rev. James E. Freeman, bishop of the Episcopal diocese of Washington, D. C.
Mrs. James E. Friend, New Orleans, president of National Council of Jewish Women.
Thomas S. Gates, Philadelphia, partner of J. P. Morgan & Co. and Drexel & Co., bankers.
William P. Gest, Philadelphia, banker.
Walter S. Gifford, New York, president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.
William Green, Washington, D. C., president of the American Federation of Labor.
His Eminence Patrick Cardinal Hayes, archbishop of the Roman Catholic diocese of New York.
Mrs. Alvin T. Hert, Louisville, vice chairman of the Republican National Committee.
Samuel Insull, Chicago, head of the Insull public utilities interests.
A. Johnston, Cleveland, Ohio, grand chief of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.
Jesse H. Jones, Houston, Tex., banker and newspaper owner.

Frank B. Kellogg, St. Paul, former Secretary of State and Senator, and now judge of the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague.

Thomas W. Lamont, New York, banker, member of the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co.

John L. Lewis, Indianapolis, president of the United Mine Workers of America.

John G. Lonsdale, St. Louis, Mo., banker.

Ernest W. Marland, Ponca City, Okla., president of the Marland Oil Co.

Samuel Mather, Cleveland, capitalist.

Miss Gertrude McNally, Washington, D. C., secretary-treasurer National Federation of Federal Employees.

John B. Miller, Los Angeles, Calif., chairman of the Southern California Edison Co. and member of the board of incorporators of the American Red Cross.

Frank Morrison, Washington, D. C., secretary of the American Federation of Labor.

Ralph T. O'Neil, Indianapolis, national commander of American Legion.

Redfield Proctor, Proctor, Vt., former Governor of Vermont.

William Cooper Procter, Cincinnati, Ohio, soap manufacturer.

George Franklin Rand, Buffalo, N. Y., banker and head of the Remington-Rand Co.

Mrs. Corinne Roosevelt Robinson, New York, sister of the late President Roosevelt.

Mrs. F. Louis Slade, New York, welfare worker.

Mrs. John F. Sipple, Washington, D. C., president General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Myron C. Taylor, New York, lawyer, director and chairman of the finance committee of the United States Steel Corporation.

Melvin A. Traylor, Chicago, president of the First National Bank of Chicago.

Elbert Lee Trinkle, Roanoke, Va., former Governor of Virginia.

Felix M. Warburg, New York, banker.

Daniel G. Wing, Boston, Mass., chairman of the board of the First National Bank of Boston.

Rabbi Stephen Samuel Wise, New York.

A. F. Whitney, Cleveland, Ohio, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen.

Dr. Mary Woolley, Mount Holyoke, Mass., president of Mount Holyoke College.

Owen D. Young, New York, chairman of the board of the General Electric Co.

Joseph Wayne, jr., Philadelphia, president of the Philadelphia National Bank.

EXHIBIT A

EXECUTIVE MANSION, February 16, 1887.

To the House of Representatives:

I return without my approval House bill No. 10203, entitled "An act to enable the Commissioner of Agriculture to make a special distribution of seeds in the drought-stricken counties of Texas, and making an appropriation therefor."

It is represented that a long-continued and extensive drought has existed in certain portions of the State of Texas, resulting in a failure of crops and consequent distress and destitution.

Though there has been some difference in statements concerning the extent of the people's needs in the localities thus affected, there seems to be no doubt that there has existed a condition calling for relief; and I am willing to believe that, notwithstanding the aid already furnished, a donation of seed grain to the farmers located in this region, to enable them to put in new crops, would serve to avert a continuance or return of an unfortunate blight.

And yet I feel obliged to withhold my approval of the plan, as proposed by this bill, to indulge a benevolent and charitable sentiment through the appropriation of public funds for that purpose.

I can find no warrant for such an appropriation in the Constitution, and I do not believe that the power and duty of the General Government ought to be extended to the relief of individual suffering which is in no manner properly related to the public service or benefit. A prevalent tendency to disregard the limited mission of this power and duty should, I think, be steadfastly resisted, to the end that the lesson should be constantly enforced that though the people support the Government the Government should not support the people.

The friendliness and charity of our countrymen can always be relied upon to relieve their fellow citizens in misfortune. This has been repeatedly and quite lately demonstrated. Federal aid in such cases encourages the expectation of paternal care on the part of the Government and weakens the sturdiness of our national character, while it prevents the indulgence among our people of that kindly sentiment and conduct which strengthens the bonds of a common brotherhood.

It is within my personal knowledge that individual aid has to some extent already been extended to the sufferers mentioned in this bill. The failure of the proposed appropriation of \$10,000 additional to meet the emergency is fully made known to the people of the country.

It is here suggested that the Commissioner of Agriculture is annually directed to expend a large sum of money for the purchase, propagation, and distribution of seeds and other things of this description, two-thirds of which are, upon the request of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, supplied to them for distribution among their constituents.

The appropriation of the current year for this purpose is \$100,000, and it will probably be no less in the appropriation for the

ensuing year. I understand that a large quantity of grain is furnished for such distribution, and it is supposed that this free apportionment among their neighbors is a privilege which may be waived by our Senators and Representatives.

If sufficient of them should request the Commissioner of Agriculture to send their shares of the grain thus allowed them to the suffering farmers of Texas, they might be enabled to sow their crops, the constituents for whom in theory this grain is intended could well bear the temporary deprivation, and the donors would experience the satisfaction attending deeds of charity.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I make the point of order against the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] on the ground that it is a violation of the unanimous-consent agreement, which reads as follows:

I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas to the pending bill was adopted be reconsidered; that the question of the adoption of that amendment be the pending question when the Senate meets on Monday next; and that a final vote on the adoption of that amendment and a final vote disposing of all motions pertaining thereto be had not later than 4 o'clock on Monday afternoon next.

The motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania is to postpone action on this amendment until the 9th of February.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania desire to be heard?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the inclusion of the reference to motions pertaining to the amendment was intended to cover the motion which I made this morning, and I think a fair reading of the unanimous-consent agreement would give it that construction. It is merely a matter of construction of the language which I used in asking unanimous consent on Saturday.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is ready to rule. Does the Senator from Nebraska desire to be heard?

Mr. NORRIS. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of the opinion that under the unanimous-consent agreement the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania is not in order. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, in connection with the debate on the subject now before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the New York World of to-day entitled "Government Doles and the Red Cross"; also another editorial appearing in the New York Times of to-day entitled "Hasty Legislation"; also another editorial appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of to-day headed "Kill the Food Dole"; also another editorial appearing in the Philadelphia Ledger of to-day entitled "The Senate's Chance to Redeem Itself"; also another editorial appearing in this morning's Washington Post entitled "States as Beggars," all of these editorials having to do with the subject matter now before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorials are as follows:

[From New York World, January 19, 1931]

GOVERNMENT DOLES AND THE RED CROSS

Its benevolent purpose fails to excuse the Robinson amendment to the Interior Department appropriation bill providing for a Government gift to the Red Cross for relief of need in the drought belt. Provision of such a gift, or such loaning of the money as is suggested by way of compromise, would establish a precedent which can not fall to be embarrassing both to the Government and to the Red Cross in time to come.

The granting of a dole to buy food for the drought sufferers would open the way to other doles on other occasions and in other sections. There is no reason for the Government's feeding the drought sufferers that could not be cited with equal justice in the case of the bread lines in our industrial cities. Are we ready to countenance so violent a break from the consistent practice that has reserved such relief to the localities concerned with Red Cross aid and direction in grave emergencies?

To the Red Cross itself the Robinson amendment not only promises a disaster. It is disaster. The President's call to private generosity to provide the Red Cross with a special fund of \$10,000,000 gets little response. If the Government is to provide funds for Red Cross distribution the private donor, already heavily burdened by charitable demands that he feels he must meet, is likely to conclude that his help will not be needed. And if this policy prevails, such embarrassment will dog Red Cross efforts not only

now but in future emergencies. Congress should think twice before opening a Pandora's box of present and future troubles by inaugurating the policy of Federal doles.

[From New York Times, January 19, 1931]

HASTY LEGISLATION

There are two solid objections to the amendment voted by the Senate on Saturday, appropriating \$25,000,000 to buy food for the needy. The fact that the money may be spent under the direction of the Red Cross does not affect the main issues. These are, first, that the proposed legislation is vicious in form and would constitute a bad precedent. The amendment is attached to the Interior Department bill, where it strictly has no place. It is that very objectionable thing, which is against the rules of both Houses of Congress, namely, a "rider" upon an appropriation bill. Ex-President Coolidge has just been remarking upon the mischief of that way of legislating. If it is agreed to in this one instance it will be applied in others, and surely return to plague the very men who now favor it.

Fully as important is the fact that, in the second place, this appropriation of money from the Federal Treasury would throw into confusion the effort of the Red Cross to raise \$10,000,000, or as much as may be necessary, by voluntary subscription. That plan has been the settled and successful American way of meeting an emergency like the present. There is to-day no sound reason for departing from it. Senator REED, of Pennsylvania, is to make a sensible motion that Congress vote no money for the Red Cross until after February 9, when it will be known whether the needful funds can be obtained by free gift. It ought to be possible to rally support in Congress for this proposal. Members can not have a deliberate purpose to thwart the work of the Red Cross, or to muddle it all up by leaving the people in doubt what actually is to be done. In this sense, too, the Senate amendment is most ill-timed.

One aim of it is further to embarrass and, if possible, discredit President Hoover. It is a kind of return blow for his victory over the Senate in the matter of an appropriation to aid farmers whose crops have been destroyed by the drought. If such a motive really exists, it needs only to be stated to be condemned. Senators seem to forget that the President has a special responsibility in the matter of public expenditures. He submits an executive budget which Congress, to be sure, has the power to exceed, but just now would do so at peril of disorganizing the public finances. Already a deficit at the end of the next fiscal year is indicated. It may grow to a large figure unless Congress is severely economical. Just now the returns from British income taxes are coming into the Exchequer, and are showing a surprisingly heavy loss. By March 15 our own Treasury will be getting a basis for its estimates of revenue, and all the indications are that they will give a shock to the lavish spenders in Congress. If this needless appropriation of \$25,000,000 goes through, their responsibility for putting the Treasury deep "in the red" will be apparent to all. It is doubtless vividly apparent to President Hoover now.

In his renewal appeal for the Red Cross there is no direct reference to the Senate action. But he plainly has it in mind when he speaks of the "sound American tradition" of depending upon the "spirit of voluntary aid" in such a crisis. With Mr. Coolidge and Alfred Smith on the President's new nation-wide committee to raise \$10,000,000 or more, the success of his plan can not be in doubt.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, January 19, 1931]

KILL THE FOOD DOLE

To-day the Senate will reconsider the Caraway-Robinson \$25,000,000 food dole amendment which it tacked on to the Interior Department appropriation bill on Saturday. This amendment is one of the worst examples of wasteful and dangerous demagoguery to come to our attention for a long time. It puts a financial burden, for which no honest justification is offered, on the shoulders of those who can least afford to bear it. It tramples roughshod on the principle of States' rights. It puts the Senate in competition with the Red Cross in raising funds for the alleviation of drought sufferers. To-day the Senate should turn its back on this food dole, the real object of which is the manufacture of political capital. The public, truly desirous of giving assistance to those who need it, is opposed to this raid. It is prepared to back the President to the limit.

[From the Philadelphia Public Ledger, January 19, 1931]

THE SENATE'S CHANCE TO REDEEM ITSELF

To-day will bring the final test of those Senators who on Saturday rushed through the Robinson amendment appropriating \$25,000,000, against the wishes of the American Red Cross, for food to be distributed by that organization among drought sufferers in the South. The opportunity that has been provided for reconsidering their action will put them squarely on record either as resolved to authorize this raid on the Treasury and to take the first step toward setting up a dole system in this country or as deferring to considerations of sound public policy and refusing to countenance this unwise departure. Unfortunately, there is no reason for believing that they will reverse their snap judgment. While the vote was taken at a time when most of the administration supporters were absent, the all-powerful coalition has previously declared its position on this question.

The Red Cross, the logical agency for administering this relief, has appealed for \$10,000,000 with the assurance that it will be ample. About one-tenth of that sum has been subscribed, and it is believed that much more would have been received by this time except for the unwise agitation in the Senate. Private charity should take care of this emergency through the regular channels. There is every indication that it will be able to do so. But in any event the matter is not one for the Federal Government. Before appealing to Washington it is the duty of State and local authorities to take action.

Particularly insidious is the manner in which Senator ROBINSON has sought to attain this end. By attaching his proposal to the Interior Department bill, which already contained items totaling \$34,000,000 for relief of drought and unemployment conditions, he has imperiled the passage of this essential legislation and strengthened the threat of an extra session. Senator REED makes the reasonable suggestion that the Robinson amendment be postponed a few weeks in order to give the Red Cross time to raise its \$10,000,000. Two months ago this same Senator ROBINSON signed that famous pledge of cooperation in all good works and against obstructive and trouble-making tactics. If he really meant what he said, now is the time to show it.

[From the Washington Post, January 19, 1931]

STATES AS BEGGARS

The willingness of States and cities to take charity from the United States Government is a reproach to the old American spirit. Several communities have brought shame upon themselves by asking for Federal relief before taxing their own resources. In other communities business men are raising the cry, "charity begins at home," in support of their assertion that they are already heavily burdened in keeping their enterprises going, thereby avoiding discharge of employees. They say they are helping the unemployment relief funds of their home towns, and they use this fact as an excuse for refusing to contribute to the American Red Cross.

It is true that "charity begins at home." But why is this precept ignored by the governors of the States? So far as known, the sovereign and proud State of Arkansas has not lifted a finger to care for the drought sufferers within its borders. At any rate it has not done its best. If any one should suggest relief to Arkansas on the ground that it was bankrupt and without credit, the people of that State would be deeply resentful. But the spokesmen of Arkansas in Congress are howling for help from the United States when their own State government is capable of borrowing money and relieving its own people. Charity, from their point of view, should begin in Washington.

Arkansas is mentioned merely as an example of what all the States are doing. They are shirking their duty when they demand a dole from the United States Treasury, except as a desperate and final resort. Not a single State has reached that stage. The bonds of any State are gilt-edged, exempt from the Federal income tax, and salable in the open market. The governors are installed and perfectly capable of calling the legislatures into extraordinary session to deal with the emergency. Immediate advances could be made in most of the States, to be replaced by funds raised by a bond issue.

If any State should come forward and certify that it has tried to raise emergency funds upon its credit and is unable to do so, it should be assisted by Congress in feeding its people. Such a situation would be comparable to invasion by an enemy, in which case the Federal Government is empowered to act. But until a State has faithfully tried to relieve its citizens and finds that it can not perform that duty, Congress should refuse to encourage the tendency of the States to become mendicants.

The discussion in Congress indicates that many legislators are confused over this question. They are inclined to yield to the demand for a \$25,000,000 appropriation to be used for relieving distress within the States. The champions for this dole are very urgent, evidently hoping to rush through the appropriation before Congress grasps the fact that the States are shirking their duty.

The 20 drought States have credit. They can easily borrow \$25,000,000 or even \$50,000,000. Every State in which the unemployed must be fed can finance this relief. There is no excuse for a raid upon the Treasury. The plan to take \$25,000,000 from the Treasury and hand it to the Red Cross is an attempt to saddle upon the United States a burden that should be borne by the States. It is high time for the Representatives of "grand old commonwealths" to resist the movement that would falsely advertise their States as bankrupts and beggars.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I understand that under the unanimous-consent agreement we are to vote at 4 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is true.

Mr. BLACK. For that reason I do not wish to speak very long, and unless some questions are asked I shall not do it.

Certain statements were made on the floor of the Senate on Saturday by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] in which he had something to say with reference to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas. The fight on this floor to-day is but a continuation of the same old struggle made in every government between those who

represent the viewpoint that a government should be operated for the benefit of a specially privileged few and those who take the opposite philosophy and believe that the government should be operated for the many.

It is natural that the administration to-day should attempt to marshal its forces in order to defeat this amendment. There is nothing strange about it whatever. The Republican Party, as it is controlled and has been for a long time, is the peculiar vehicle through which the specially privileged big business interests of America seek complete control of this Government. Naturally they are always apprehensive. When the question arises as to the establishment of a precedent which in the ultimate end would assess some tax upon those privileged classes who are best able to pay, the Republican leader cracks the party whip and marshals his forces. That this has been done is quite evident on the floor of the Senate this morning.

The effort has been made to postpone action upon the amendment. When would the vote be taken? We all know that this, the winter season, is the worst time of the year for those who are cold and hungry. If the money is needed at all it is needed now, this moment. But the effort is made to postpone a vote, the idea being that the longer it is delayed the more likely the Republican beneficiaries of special greed are to relieve themselves from any contribution to this worthy cause. It has always been true that the specially privileged in government have not cared whether there was starvation or not, so long as they could continue a system of laws whereby they obtain a disproportionate part of the fruits of labor and the toil of the many.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] denies that the opposition to this amendment is based on the fear of increased taxes. It is manifest, as was stated by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] a few days ago, that the whole background of this entire fight for help for our destitute and suffering people is that those who are best able to pay and to sustain the Government are the least willing to do it and, furthermore, will exert every possible effort to prevent any amendment or any law which forces them to pay their full share of the maintenance of the Government.

None of us dispute that in ordinary circumstances local calamity should be taken care of by ordinary local means. That is done in the homes of the poor; it is done in the orphans' homes; it is done through the community chest. But this situation is entirely different. It is national in one aspect and confined to 21 drought-stricken States in another aspect. In so far as it is nation-wide it calls for a nation-wide remedy. It is not a question of a storm sweeping over one section of the country. It is a question of nation-wide depression, which was brought on partly by Republican laws enacted for the benefit of the specially privileged group. A national treatment of the problem threatens to place a just burden on swollen incomes and bloated fortunes.

So to-day the administration Republican forces, true to their principles, are marshaling for the fight to protect from any possibility of taxation these excessive incomes. It might as well be realized now as hereafter that the fight is on in this country between those who believe in placing property rights above human rights and those who take the contrary view.

The condition which confronts us has been produced either by causes which were avoidable or unavoidable. If it is because of avoidable causes, which the Government can take care of, then let the Government meet its responsibility. If unavoidable and simply due to a defect in a system which permits recurrence of cycles of starvation and want, then the responsibility is no less that of the people through their Government.

But the statement is made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] that this burden would not be borne by a surtax on excessive incomes. It will be borne by a surtax on excessive incomes if the wishes of the people of the country shall control the legislation in arriving at the next tax law. The theory has been exploded that we must exempt huge profits in order to bring about an expansion of industry. Industry has expanded to-day until we have

saturated not only our own markets but those of the world. In a recent article in a magazine attention was called to the fact that we can produce 900,000,000 pairs of shoes per year, but that the peak load that we have ever sold was 300,000,000 pairs. So it is with reference to all the other products of industry. In the past we have exempted huge incomes on the theory that our industry would thereby expand. The result has been an overexpansion and an overproduction. If we do what we should, Congress will abandon this exploded theory, and the burden of this appropriation, as well as the burden of other increased appropriations, will be placed upon incomes and wealth in proportion to ability to pay.

No one calls the huge donations to the railroad companies a dole. No one calls the millions donated to the shipping interests a dole. They have been granted by the hundreds of millions of dollars. But the very moment we ask for help for those who are weak and those who are destitute and those who are hungry, it becomes a dole. The proposed \$10,000,000 for the Red Cross can not be raised except from the few. Telegrams in the Record show that to be the fact. The evidence which Senators have show it. None of us believe that we should not secure donations from private interests if we can; but we believe also that when a situation arises in which it is necessary for the Public Treasury to help relieve the starving people of the Nation, it should be done.

It is interesting to note the appointment of leading politicians of the country for the Red Cross drive. All of us anticipated that some such play would result from the delay on the pending amendment from Saturday until Monday; that was anticipated. It came this morning, and some great men in politics in this country have been named on a nation-wide committee. Those men, however, are not to control the manner in which this money shall be distributed; they are not to determine whether \$4 per week shall be the amount allotted to helpless families of six. These gentlemen are to be used to-day for the purpose of giving force to the President's argument that Congress should not meet this situation fairly, squarely, and justly. It is purely on its face a patent bid for public political favor. It is a manipulation of political methods to attempt to bring about a sentiment to prevent the passage of this or some other similar measure.

Mr. President, the suggestion has been made with reference to the handling of the present situation by the administration forces that if noise, political manipulation, politically inspired editorials, political conferences, and high-sounding promises could feed the hungry they would all be fed, and that, in fact, they would be suffering from indigestion caused by excessive food.

However, some of us take the position that high-sounding political promises can not feed the hungry; that political manipulation can not relieve the distressed; that the appointment of well-known men throughout the country can not change the distressing situation which faces us. We feel that \$10,000,000 is entirely inadequate. Everyone who has studied the situation knows it is not sufficient. We are having to-day another illustration of the danger of an alliance of the American Red Cross and of those who control the prevailing administration of national affairs. The administration takes the position that no money should be contributed out of the public funds to relieve the hungry and distressed, and straightway we find some members of the Red Cross allied with members of the President's Cabinet to put over the administration's ideas. In other words, the administration has had a big fight; the administration has had what has been called by administration favorites a "glorious victory"; it has had a victory over the poor, hungry people of the drought-stricken States. Its satellite newspapers have heralded that victory to the world; they have said that the President, in all his strength and in all his vigor, has shown his manhood and has saved the Treasury from relieving widespread distress. Straightway the Red Cross, allied as it is to-day with the administration, follows in the administration footsteps; testimony is given

by its chairman before the Appropriations Committee that no more money is needed, and within three days an appeal has to be made for additional funds. Why was that statement made? It was exactly in line with the method which the administration has been using to stifle any bill which was intended to afford adequate relief for the situation in this country.

Mr. President, there is not the slightest justification for the argument made by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] that we should not legislate on this subject, because by parliamentary machinery in the House our legislation may not pass. This body can put itself on record. It has done so heretofore; it will do so again. The Senate of the United States is one governmental institution which has shown by its past record, and will again do so, that in a conflict between the rights of property and the rights of humanity it can adopt the humanitarian as opposed to the property side.

Again I say that the Republican Party, as controlled to-day, is the vehicle through which the big, specially privileged, greedy, predatory interests have controlled this Government for years. They are opposed to any measure which will adequately relieve distress, wherever it is found in this country if it involves their taxes. For that reason they have marshaled as many as they could and have cracked the party whip in order to defeat any legislation which the same specially protected interests believe may be injurious to them.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the Washington Post this morning contains a very ugly and vicious editorial, which is entitled "States as Beggars." I will read only a few words from this editorial:

The willingness of States and cities to take charity from the United States Government is a reproach to the old American spirit. Several communities have brought shame upon themselves by asking for Federal relief before taxing their own resources.

Mr. President, I wonder if the author of that editorial thinks that the people of the United States are unfamiliar with certain activities of the Federal Government. Why should this man assail Senators who are seeking to obtain relief for people back in their States when they can obtain relief from no other source? It has been stated here time and time again that banks are failing all over the country, that merchants are failing, that farmers are in distress because of crop failures. The people in the various communities affected are not able to take care of those who are in distress. The individuals who used to be able to do so are now financially embarrassed, and the situation is an extraordinary one.

Mr. President, I have never known of an editorial writer in the Washington Post criticizing this Government for taking money out of the Public Treasury and loaning it to the railroads to the amount of millions and hundreds of millions of dollars, and we will not ever see a criticism in that newspaper against such loans as that.

I have called the attention of the Senate and of the country recently to loans that are now being made by the Government to the Ship Trust, aggregating in the neighborhood of \$150,000,000, but the Washington Post has never had an editorial criticizing that disposition of public funds. Has the editorial writer of the Washington Post ever complained that this Government had no business loaning the people's money to private enterprise? Have you, Mr. President, ever heard him say anything about the shipbuilders of the country reaching their hands into the Public Treasury and having money doled out to them for their private purposes? Not once.

Mr. President, it was pointed out here on Saturday, by myself among others, that we loaned to the people of Porto Rico, to the big coffee planters, amounts up to \$25,000, to be paid back in 10 years' time, because they were suffering on account of a storm. This newspaper never published any editorial criticizing Congress for doing that; but, in the face of the worst drought, as the Secretary of Agriculture has told Congress in his report, the country has ever experienced, when we are living in the midst of the worst depression that we have ever known, except during periods of colossal

panics, and when the States are unable to meet the needs of the people within their borders, then this newspaper publishes an editorial criticizing the people in the States and criticizing the Senate, casting reflections upon those who are in distress and telling them that they have brought shame on themselves because they have turned to their Government, the Government which they love, the Government which they support in time of peace and defended in time of war. Mr. President, I should think it would be quite natural for a man who is in dire distress, whose wife and children around him are hungry and begging him to supply them with food with which to sustain life, when he has failed to obtain relief from other places, to turn to his great Government which he sees loaning money to the extent of millions of dollars to the railroads, loaning money in other millions to the shipbuilders, and refunding millions of dollars of taxes to the millionaires. Why should not these patriotic men and women lift their eyes and their hands and their voices to their Government and appeal to it to come to their rescue when the wolf of want is howling at their doors. I have nothing but contempt for an editorial writer of this character. This man does not know anything about how to sympathize with people in distress; he does not care anything about people in distress; the wails of want that are heard around this Nation are of no concern to him. He is no doubt getting a fat salary for writing such editorials; but, Mr. President, the Senate is justified in appropriating this amount, as I said the other day, to supplement what the Red Cross can raise under the appeal of the President. In my judgment, what the Red Cross will raise and what we may appropriate will not be adequate to meet the needs of those who are now suffering and in want.

Here is what I fear: If the Senate shall adjourn on the 4th of March and no extra session shall be held, within six weeks or two months after that time there will be distress in this country which the Red Cross fund will be inadequate to meet, and the President will either be compelled to call an extra session or there will be great suffering throughout the country, which the Red Cross will not be able to relieve; it will not be able to supply the wants and needs of the people who may then be in distress.

Mr. President, this question has been discussed at length, and I do not desire to detain the Senate longer. I want action upon it; I want to get the bill containing the amendment over to the House, and we may then see if they are ready to strike down again this measure which would carry relief, comfort, and happiness to millions of distressed patriotic American citizens.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I concede at once that every Senator in this body is just as honest as I am, and just as anxious to do the right thing by his country as I can possibly be. I concede that there are others here far wiser than I am; but I have read that some things are denied to the wise and revealed unto babes.

I can not understand how any Senator who really knows about the unemployment and distress in the United States can fail to be moved. I doubt if any Senator who does know has not been moved.

Mr. President, I have seen with my own eyes what is going on. I hold in my hand a photograph of the soup line at the municipal lodging house in New York City. I was there on the Sunday between Christmas and New Year's. I saw this heartbreaking sight. Nine thousand—9,000—unemployed persons formed a line in order that each man might have a tin cup of soup, slices of bread, and a cup of coffee; 9,000 of them at the moment I was there! There are other places in the city of New York where we have similar bread lines.

What sort of persons are they who are in these lines? I heard a hint from one Senator the other day that tramps come and gladly line up to get the food which is doled out by the philanthropy of kind-hearted persons in the city of New York and other cities. What is the truth?

I have here an article by Heywood Brown, printed in the current number of *The Unemployed*, a magazine issued in

New York. Heywood Broun went down to visit the bread line; and one paragraph of what he said will be of especial interest to you. I quote:

I do not think any one of us can walk by a bread line and see even the most unkempt and ragged man in the line without saying to himself, "There, but for the grace of God."

Purposely I started at the bottom of the line in order to work up. More than three-quarters of the men on bread lines are eager to work—to work at anything. One-quarter of them held steady jobs until the depression, and more than half were never on a bread line before in their lives. Nobody likes to stand on a bread line. It is not any fun; but it is possible for every man born alive to get so hungry that he must even swallow his pride. I say that the richest city and the richest country in the world ought to be able to break the bread line.

Mr. President, I have seen these things with my own eyes. I know that in my city are hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children who have no income and are dependent upon charity. I have spoken of these things before, and I repeat them now to those who are interested.

My fear is that Senators are so sheltered and protected, so guarded from actual contact with poverty, that some of them fail to realize what is going on in this country. Most of us dine sumptuously every day. I meet Senators at dinners given in Washington almost every night. Some of these Senators never leave Washington, it is so comfortable here, such a happy place to be; and the United States Senate is the finest club in the world. It offers every facility to aid creature comfort. It caters to every taste. It gives one such social standing that invitations come from everywhere; and so Senators live richly and dine sumptuously every day.

My friends, let us not close our eyes and our hearts to what we read, even though we do not come into personal contact with poverty and distress. Let us believe that these things which we read in the newspapers are actually true. If they are true, how can one who picks up any newspaper fail to be touched by the recital of distress throughout every part of our country?

Here is a newspaper which this morning had an editorial condemning this plan of relief and reciting in strong words why the Senate should not adopt this amendment. On the front page of that very newspaper we find this:

To-day's reports to Chairman Payne told of new conditions of distress in Texas, Tennessee, and Mississippi, where the Red Cross had not been extending help.

In another place:

The number of sufferers in the drought area receiving Red Cross aid has more than doubled since January 1. Judge John Barton Payne, chairman of the American Red Cross, announced to-night. Distress is reported in communities where the organization had not been providing food. The increasing gravity of the situation is emphasized in reports of field workers who told of heavier demands for assistance.

On the front page of a newspaper which condemns the pending amendment is a news item from Louisville, Ky. I quote:

Within the last two weeks applications for help have increased 50 per cent; and local Red Cross chapters, with some aid from the national body—

"With some aid from the national body"—

are now caring for 28,700 persons. Local resources, with the exception of those of a few counties, are exhausted.

I quote language found in the same newspaper which had the editorial condemning any effort at relief as proposed in the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

I quote further:

Last July Dr. A. T. McCormack, State health officer, made a survey of 64 counties. He found health conditions so deplorable that he estimated that one-fifth of the population, or 500,000 persons, would need help during the winter. Nobody would believe him. The State drought board made another survey in September, and found the board of health estimate being borne out. Now even the Red Cross workers admit that it may be correct. One of these, in a visit up one creek in the hills, found 30 cabins with no fires going because there was nothing to cook.

There has been little in the newspapers about the Kentucky people's misery. It is only recently that the full extent of the disaster has begun to be realized.

Mr. President, why do we not believe these things? Just because we are sheltered and protected from personal con-

tact with such poverty and distress, do we actually believe that poverty and distress do not exist in the country? I sometimes feel that that is our attitude.

I have in my hand another newspaper. I ought to say that with one exception every newspaper in my city this morning, by editorial utterance, condemned any action such as is proposed here to vote this money. When I stand on my feet because of my personal conviction that we as a country can not afford to disregard this economic distress, this human suffering, I am taking a position which undoubtedly will be condemned by almost every metropolitan newspaper; but I can not help it. I have seen human distress; I have seen persons suffering from hunger and from cold; and even though I stood alone, Mr. President, I could take no other position than one of support for any measure which has in it the hope of immediate relief of distress and human suffering.

Mr. President, I have made reference to and have shown you a picture indicating that thousands of men are in line in front of the soup houses in New York. I am now about to make reference to an appeal made by the Episcopal bishop and other churchmen in New York. I do not do it, however, with any desire or expectation that any money voted shall be sent to my city. We do not want one dollar. We do not need one dollar. We will take care of our own.

I speak of things that I have seen with my own eyes because they are an index of what is going on in America. We sit here so complacently, imagining that the social structure is safe; that the political structure is beyond danger! What can men think of, what can they be thinking of, when they know that everywhere in this broad country, from Maine to California and from Michigan to the Gulf, there is unemployment, there is hunger, there is cold? How can we imagine that society will endure these things forever?

I am not an extremist, nor an alarmist, I trust. I do not believe that I habitually see Indians where no Indians exist; but I want the thinking men of the country to know that this country is in danger. These people are not going to lie down and die if by any means they can get the necessities of life. Just bear that in mind, my friends.

By reference to another newspaper which had an editorial condemning the proposed legislation, I find this:

The Social Service Commission of the Diocese of New York, which includes prominent members of the laity and the clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church, yesterday addressed a letter to Mayor Walker, urging him and the board of estimate "to make available at once \$2,000,000 a month for as many months as the situation may require, to be used for employing in the various departments of the city government heads of families who are unable to find work and whose families are in need."

In the richest city in the world! The letter, signed by Bishop Manning, Suffragan Bishops Gilbert and Lloyd, and the Rev. Floyd Van Keuren, executive secretary of the commission, is a transmission of a unanimous resolution made by the commission, of which Charles C. Burlingham, lawyer, is chairman.

Mr. President, my city will provide that money. We will give these millions. But how are the poverty-stricken communities in every part of our country to find the money necessary to care for those who are suffering and dying?

I have great respect for the Red Cross. The first chapter of the American Red Cross was founded in my State 50 years ago in 1831. In Dansville, N. Y., Clara Barton instituted the first chapter of the Red Cross. They are hoping to have a celebration in Dansville this year to call public attention to the fact that the American Red Cross is now 50 years of age.

Of course, I have great respect for that organization. In my training in medicine I have come in contact with the nursing activities of the American Red Cross, and of the Red Cross of other countries. Noble service has been rendered by this great organization, and at this moment I have not a word of criticism to pass upon it.

But it must be confessed, Mr. President, we are here to-day considering this matter because the Red Cross did not wake up to the importance of the crisis.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair).
Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I understood the Senator to say that the appeal by the Episcopal bishop of New York for the appropriation of \$2,000,000 of city funds to take care of the destitute and suffering in the city of New York will be made.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is to say, governmental funds are to be used for that purpose?

Mr. COPELAND. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Are we to understand that the metropolitan press is protesting against the application of city funds—that is, governmental funds—for that purpose, and insisting that the Red Cross can take care of the situation by private contributions?

Mr. COPELAND. Of course, I do not know what will be the attitude of the metropolitan press toward this appeal to the government of my city for public funds, but the metropolitan press, with almost perfect unanimity, this morning condemned any appeal now for funds from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I understood that was only a protest against the appropriation of national funds.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes; of national funds.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I was curious about where they drew the line.

Mr. COPELAND. I do not know where they draw the line, but I do know that the great heart of New York, whether it is the heart of the populace or the heart of the local government, will respond to every appeal such as this, and this money will be given. We have raised over \$8,000,000, given by private subscriptions to the Prosser committee, but the Prosser committee itself has gone to the local government and said, "In addition to what we have raised privately, we must have \$10,000,000 dollars more in order that relief may be afforded."

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. If those enormous sums are required simply for the relief of the people of the city of New York, is it unreasonable to suppose that the vast area embracing the drought-stricken territory, covered by practically 21 or 22 States, could be taken care of with an appropriation of only \$10,000,000, or with only \$10,000,000 raised by the Red Cross?

Mr. COPELAND. I agree fully with the thought the Senator has in mind, that with such limited sums the Red Cross could not deal effectively and adequately with the needs of the country.

I myself told Judge Payne in the hearing that four and a half million dollars was only a flea bite. How can we hope to take care of the 250,000 who the Red Cross officials state need to be fed in Arkansas? How can that be done and those in Kentucky and 21 and 22 other States, who are suffering, be taken care of? It is absurd to say that with four and a half million, or fourteen and a half million, adequate relief can be given.

Mr. President, I have never said that this national calamity is the fault of the President; but I have said, and I repeat now, that the administration has failed to acknowledge that we have such a desperate condition with which to deal. Not until this morning has there been contrite confession of the situation.

I find in the President's letter dated Washington, January 18, this language:

We are faced with a national emergency.

He has never said that before. The administration has never admitted it. It was with the greatest difficulty that we extracted from the witnesses before the Committee on Appropriations the fact that there is widespread unemployment and suffering in the United States. Colonel Woods testified

that there are at least four and a half million unemployed persons in the United States.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Has the Senator learned, or has he been able to learn, what recommendations were made to the President by Colonel Woods with respect to a Federal appropriation for the relief of distress?

Mr. COPELAND. I am sorry to say that Colonel Woods had left the witness room before anybody asked him that question. I can not answer it. I have been told on the sidelines that he asked for more money, but I can not answer the question. I do not know.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. My information is that he asked for at least four times the amount called for by the pending amendment. I do not state that upon the authority of Colonel Woods himself, or of anyone purporting to quote him.

Mr. COPELAND. I can not quote Colonel Woods or speak for him, but I have such confidence in Colonel Woods, in his integrity and common sense, that I know he must have asked for more money. Perhaps most of the four and a half million unemployed are heads of families, and how can we expect four and a half million heads of families, representing 20,000,000 persons, men, women, and children, to be taken care of in the dead of winter with four and a half million dollars? The miracle of the loaves and fishes would be nothing in comparison! A dollar a family! It is absurd!

Mr. President, I want to make reference to a statement in one of the editorials in a New York newspaper this morning. I quote:

One aim of it—

That is, of the Robinson amendment—

One aim of it is further to embarrass, and, if possible, discredit, President Hoover.

I deny that with all the strength of my body and soul. So far as I am concerned—and I am sure I speak for every man on this side when I say it—we are not thinking about President Hoover; we are not thinking about whether he is going to be embarrassed or unembarrassed by what we do. We are thinking about those in distress.

As far as I am concerned, when I have voted here on nominations sent to us by the President my first desire has been, if possible, to vote for confirmation. That is what I want to do. Great pressure was brought to bear on me not to vote for the confirmation of a certain nomination for justice of the Supreme Court. I voted for it. Pressure was brought to bear on me to vote for the nomination of another member of the Supreme Court. I did not do so. When I voted for the one and against the other, I did not in either case endeavor to please or displease the President. I voted my convictions. When anybody says this amendment was offered to embarrass the President, that statement is grotesque and absurd and untrue. This amendment is brought here in good faith and will be voted for by the Members of the Senate because of an honest desire, not to embarrass the President but to relieve human suffering.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] this morning argued very strongly against any appropriation on the part of the Government, because, they said, we would be interfering with a function which is essentially a Red Cross function. I do not so regard it. We are dealing here with a national emergency. We are dealing here with a situation which affects every State in the Union. It is entirely different from the relief of conditions caused locally by drought, or flood, or fire, or cyclone, or hurricane, or earthquake, entirely different from the case where a local section of our country, a small area, comparatively, is affected and distressed. We have here a problem which is so widespread that it affects the entire Union. It is far beyond any adequate relief which can be given by the Red Cross.

I do not want anything to interfere with this appeal of the Red Cross; I hope it will be successful. But the weakness of

the argument used by the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Michigan is that there is exactly the same psychological effect involved in what they propose as in the Robinson amendment. If the Robinson amendment will lead people to say, "No; we will not give, because the Government will give the money," exactly the same criticism attaches to the Reed proposal or the Vandenberg proposal, because their proposal is, "Let us wait three weeks, and then if we do not get the money the Government will vote it." Those who are inclined to resist the one appeal will resist the other. In the meantime three precious weeks will have been lost and people will have suffered and died, perhaps, by reason of the delay.

Mr. President, I want to call attention to a matter which has not been discussed at all, and that is the effect of hunger and exposure upon the public health. Senators perhaps read in the papers yesterday that at Quantico, the marine headquarters, 175 cases of influenza were developed. I read of 49 persons dying of influenza in New York City on Saturday last. I would not wish to say that such suffering as we are discussing would result in fatalities from influenza, but it stands to reason that undernourished people, persons who are physically weakened by hunger and cold, must have such lowered powers of resistance that, with infection from tuberculosis or any other serious ailment added to influenza, physical disaster must come. I plead, therefore, in the name of the public health that there be given relief to hunger and distress wherever it is found. I am sure that in making that plea I am upon scientific grounds, and that if we are to guard our people against disease and shortened lives there must be adequate food and adequate shelter.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. DILL. The Senator omitted mention of the fact of the report that the flu had broken out in the Naval Academy at Annapolis also.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes; that is true. If these diseases get into Annapolis and Quantico, where young men with vigorous bodies and ample food fail to resist the encroachment of germs, how can we expect otherwise than that in the hovels and cabins and tenements there will be an invasion of the health of men, women, and children?

The whole thing, as I view it, Mr. President, goes back to the purpose of government. What is government for? Is the sole purpose of government the protection of property?

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] reserved for his peroration a reference to income taxes. He said that when we get the returns on the 15th of March we will be horrified to find what losses have been incurred in the country. Is that an argument why we should not give liberally now to relieve human suffering?

My friends, if there were a war declared to-morrow, the Congress without hesitation would vote \$30,000,000,000, if need be. Is not a war against want and hunger, disease and death, within our boundaries, just as important as a war brought on from outside our boundaries? Are we going to hesitate about finding somewhere the money to give relief in spite of the fact that the great income-tax payers of the country are not going to have so much to report to the Government on the 15th of March? Oh, for shame, for shame!

I am just as much interested in the large income-tax payers as any Senator here, and perhaps more so, because my colleague and I represent the great State which pays 30 per cent of the income taxes of the country. We want our constituents to have all the money they can properly get. Frankly, however, I am not going to permit my vote to be swayed by the fact that the income taxes from New York or Pennsylvania, Illinois or Massachusetts, are going to be less this year than they have been, and that because of that fact we must exercise such economy, beginning with this particular item, that there shall be no unusual appeal for taxes. Shame upon us if we determine that because of that danger we will not vote this money.

I want to say in defense of these great taxpayers that I do not believe there is a rich man in my city of New York who is not willing to contribute his share of as much as the country determines is necessary to take care of the suffering people. I make that statement believing it to be true. I know some rich people. I know more poor people than rich people, but I never heard any man, rich or poor, say, "Be careful how you vote money to take care of the poor." I never heard any man say that. I do not believe any man in my city will find fault even though it might be necessary to increase his taxes a little bit or even though it might be found impossible to lower his taxes a little bit if we vote some money to take care of the poor.

The issue goes back to the purpose of government. If the purpose of government is merely the protection of property, I say let us vote the measure down and not give it the slightest consideration. But if the purpose of government is what I believe it to be, to serve humanity and to do for the citizen those necessary and proper things that he can not do for himself, then certainly it is my conviction that we should vote the money. I would not have the Government do one thing for the individual that he can do for himself.

My little mother, a pious woman, used to say to me, "You can take all the pins off the pincushion and pray to Almighty God to put them back on it, but He will not do it." God will not do for man the things he can do for himself; but there are times when man can not help himself, and that is the situation with which we are dealing to-day. If the purpose of government is to serve humanity and do those necessary and proper things for the citizen that he can not do for himself, then certainly it is our duty to vote for this amendment.

With all regret that I can not be governed by the utterances which have come from the luxurious editorial establishments of my city—and I do say it regretfully, because I would really like to please the papers, though I rarely do—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. COPELAND. In just a moment. So far as this vote is concerned I feel that I must, in the face of every protest, vote for a measure which has to do with the health and welfare and the lives of the citizens of the entire country.

I yield now to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I was very much impressed with the early part of the speech of the Senator from New York in which he referred to the present situation in the Senate being due to a lack of appreciation, upon the part of the President and the Red Cross, of the condition existing in the country. Does the Senator recall that part of his speech?

Mr. COPELAND. Oh, yes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I wonder if the Senator has read an article in the Nation for January 14 by Mr. Amos Pinchot, relating his experience and that of a committee of bishops, bankers, manufacturers, and the like, who called on the President on June 4, 1930, to propose to him a plan for developing and opening up public projects to put the unemployed to work.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes; I read the article.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Will the Senator permit me to read a paragraph from it confirmatory of what he has said?

Mr. COPELAND. Yes; but before the Senator does so let me say that I wrote Mr. Amos Pinchot and said I thought he was inspired when he wrote the article.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The paragraph I would like to read is as follows:

We were listened to with the scant patience and restrained exasperation of a man who knew every angle of the situation far better than we who had presumed to advise him. Whereupon he launched into a clear, forcible, and convincing speech in which he proved to us that we were wrong in every point. Unemployment, he said was being shamefully exaggerated. Its peak had been reached and passed. The tide had turned. The Census and Labor Departments reports and other information to which, as he reminded us, he had better access than we, would presently show that things were quite different from what we feared. Yes;

We were now to drift peacefully, if slowly, back to good times. With calm confidence he spoke of the results that were being gained through the conference he had called of great business leaders and of their fine response to his appeal not to curtail the volume of their activities. He showed us, in authoritative style, that every agency of both the Federal and State Governments was working at top capacity to relieve the situation. "Gentlemen," he said, "you have come six weeks too late."

I think that illustrates the attitude which the administration has taken from the outset in reference to putting forth a constructive program of relief.

Mr. COPELAND. I thank the Senator for the added testimony of Mr. Pinchot that the President said he had come "six weeks too late." By the same token, I assume, it is now six months too late. In any event it was not until a half year after Mr. Pinchot was at the White House, not until the 18th of January, that the President said we are faced with a national emergency, confessing for the first time what everybody else knew to be the situation.

Mr. President, we can not let these starving and freezing people die. We can not let these little children run around barefooted in the snow. We can not let these mothers suffer, and they are the ones who do suffer—the mother denies herself and is the last one to have any relief.

Ah, my friends, let us aid the Red Cross all we can. Let us encourage every effort that great organization makes to have money to deal with emergencies when they occur. I hope they will get the \$10,000,000 for which they have asked, and twice that. But we can not afford to wait. We need the money now, and therefore I urge upon Senators that they vote for the Robinson amendment and make available at once the \$25,000,000, that there may be immediate effort at the relief of human suffering in the United States.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, this morning I received a telegram from J. B. Swett, secretary of the building trades' council of my home town of Spokane, in which he said:

SPOKANE, WASH., January 17, 1931.

Hon. C. C. DILL,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Spokane & Eastern Trust Co., the chain bank attached to the Northwest Bancorporation, in their building of their 7-story building in Spokane have permitted their general contractor to reduce wages on this construction. We have wired the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury to express themselves regarding this policy. Will you do what you can to bring about a public expression from these sources condemning wage-cutting policy?

BUILDING TRADES COUNCIL,
J. B. SWETT, Secretary.

I read this telegram because, so far as I know, it is the first effort on the part of trade contractors in the building line in the Northwest to cut wages of workingmen. I do not know what attitude the President and Secretary of the Treasury will take about this matter, but I certainly hope the condemnation asked for will be forthcoming. This is no time to begin cutting wages of the men who are given an opportunity to work.

While I have the floor I want to invite attention to the fact that much of the depression, particularly in the western part of the United States, has been due to the fact that our exports to the Orient have been cut off. This has been due largely, I think, to the fall in the price of silver. There is much discussion now going on as to the need for the stabilization of the price of silver; in fact, I think without such stabilization by international agreement there is little hope of reviving the export business to the Orient for some time to come.

I ask at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, to have printed an article by Julean Arnold, commercial attaché at Shanghai, published in the Railway and Marine News of December, 1930, and also an article by P. A. O'Farrell, published in Mining Truth, of January 8, 1931, entitled "World Needs Stabilized Coinage."

There being no objection, the articles referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Railway and Marine News, December, 1930]

HOW LOW SILVER AFFECTS CHINA'S TRADE

By Commercial Attaché Julean Arnold, Shanghai

Foreign traders in China are divided in their opinion as to the relative significance of the factors which, during recent months,

have forced a decrease in China's imports and exports. So much depends upon the viewpoint of the individual, so much upon the line of business in which he is engaged, the location of his business in China, and the extent to which the commodities in which he deals enter into the trade of the interior, that a consensus of opinion among those participating in China's foreign commerce is difficult to determine.

Internal disorders, especially in the Provinces of Hunan, Kiangsi, and surrounding territory, still continue, and the disruptions to normal trade routes are so serious as to paralyze trade. Hence, in the central Yangtze region, it may be said that the silver situation has been a factor of secondary consideration. In other sections of China, internecine warfare has been going on with varying degrees of virulence ever since the revolution of 1911. In these sections, however, the low silver values and the degree of uncertainty of silver's future, which have characterized the trade of 1930, are unprecedented, and are particularly significant in that they come at a time following the two record years in China's development of foreign commerce.

EFFECT OF LOW SILVER VALUE ON TRADE AND INDUSTRY

As Shanghai is the trading port for the entire Yangtze region, the internal disorders in the Hunan-Kiangsi section reflect adversely upon the trade of Shanghai, both in imports and exports. Undoubtedly, disorders in other parts of China adversely affect their trade also; yet it would appear that the low value of silver is more of an important factor in decreasing exports to those sections than are the internal disturbances. For instance, when a prospective consumer of a tin of California fruit is confronted to-day with a price of \$1.40 local currency, as contrasted with \$0.70 for the same tin less than a year ago, he naturally will stop to consider his pocketbook before making the purchase. Similarly, a group of Chinese capitalists contemplating the purchase of flour or cotton-mill machinery, when asked double the price as compared with quotations of a year ago, undoubtedly will hold off.

Even though this may seem a propitious time for the development of domestic industries in certain protected areas, they will have the fear that silver exchange may rise during the next few months and place them at a disadvantage compared with competitors who may purchase later. It is true that a recent tendency of silver toward stabilization, even though at low levels, has helped to encourage the placing of orders to a limited extent. Should it develop that silver actually becomes stabilized, even at the present very low level, the elimination of the element of uncertainty can not fail to prove a very helpful factor in making for at least partial recovery of China's foreign trade.

EFFECT OF INTERNAL DISTURBANCES AND TAXES

Those who would contend that China's internal disorders are more of a factor than silver in the falling off of the country's foreign trade point to the decreased volume of exports as substantiation of their contention. They are inclined to attribute China's failure to profit by the unprecedently favorable exchange—as viewed from the export angle—almost wholly to interruptions in internal communications and heavier tax burdens. On the other hand, in parts of China comparatively free of internal disturbances—in Manchuria, for instance—merchants complain that exports are not moving in enhanced volume because of the world-wide depression. They point out that during the first half of 1927, when the Yangtze River transportation was paralyzed by the internal trouble of that period, wood oil from the upper Yangtze regions filtered down overland to an outlet at Hong Kong, in response—although at greatly enhanced prices—to urgent demands for this commodity in the American market.

PRODUCTION COSTS NOT NECESSARILY THE BASIS OF PRICE FIXING

China is still so little removed from its medieval economic society that its 10,000 or 12,000 miles of railway, nearly half in Manchuria, are not of commanding importance in its internal transportation. When its railways are out of commission, traffic which formerly went by rail reverts to the cart, the wheelbarrow, the pack animal, and the human beast of burden. Furthermore, every stream in China, no matter how shallow, carries craft engaged in some sort of cargo transportation. Transportation of this sort may be considerably more expensive than transportation by rail, especially when there is added the higher internal tax exactions to which most of this primitive transportation seems to be subjected. Yet it is well to bear in mind that the bulk of China's export trade, other than in beans and raw silk, comprises what may be termed "by-products of farm labor." In other words, production costs are necessarily the bases of the prices of many of China's exports.

The poultry farmer in California is puzzled to understand why, in the face of ever-increasing tariff schedules on egg products, the Chinese hen can continue to lay eggs on a competitive basis with the highly protected product of the American hen. It is simple when he understands that there are no poultry farms in China and in that sense there is no poultry industry, although China is probably the world's greatest exporter of egg products. Every Chinese farmer keeps a few hens, but he does not depend upon them for a livelihood. He sells his eggs for what he can, the price realized representing, to his mind, "so much velvet"—that is, a supplementary return from his farming establishment with no appreciable increase of overhead. He can not afford to eat the eggs he produces unless he can find no market for them. To enjoy the luxury of eating his eggs he has to sell something else. He tries to strike the best possible balance between the small bit of land which he cultivates intensively and the good-sized family which he must support—all members of which contribute in a productive capacity—utilizing as much in the way of by-products

of their labors as the opportunities within his sphere of activity permit. If he finds that the marketing possibilities for his vegetable oil are curtailed, or that kerosene prices are advanced above his purchasing power, he may be obliged to revert to the use of the vegetable-oil lamp in spite of the years in which he has become accustomed to the use of a superior illuminant.

The Chinese farmer, however, although a primitive in his opportunities for wresting a living from nature, and isolated far from the active channels of commerce, is no less a victim than other men of the world conditions. The American manufacturer of carpets who may have drawn heavily upon north China for his carpet wools may find it necessary, because of market conditions, to reduce his output and limit his stocks of raw material and manufactured products to actual day-by-day demands. Even though China wool be quoted at lower prices, because of depressed silver exchange, he is not tempted to buy. The world's demand for China's export commodities at once becomes affected, and world demand is a very important factor in the export trade of China. If these demands are active and persistent, it is remarkable how commodities in China connive to overcome what would be considered impossible trade handicaps in a modern organized economic society. On the other hand, if the demand from abroad lessens materially, China has no organization for putting into effect modern devices for the development of new uses for its products, or for resorting to progressive salesmanship methods. Trade simply stops, and the commodities which no longer can be sold abroad go back into native consumption, with certain readjustments which may involve the curtailment of certain imports. If the purchasing power of the masses is reduced by their inability to market at a profit the commodities they produce, it is obvious that their capacity for the consumption of imports from abroad must be affected adversely.

STABILIZATION OF SILVER WOULD AID IMPORTS

Presuming that silver stabilizes at approximately its present levels, what effect will this have upon China's foreign trade? As for imports, dealers have been drawing upon stocks on hand during this period of uncertainty. Furthermore, large stocks are held in such centers as Shanghai, Tientsin, and Hong Kong, considerable of which is financed by the banks, but for which Chinese buyers have failed to close their exchange, and hence are reluctant to take delivery. This situation is more accentuated in Shanghai than elsewhere in China. The stabilizing tendency of silver during the past month or two has helped imports, lending a more hopeful tone to the situation. Moreover, lower commodity prices abroad, due to depressed conditions, have contributed to a limited extent in compensating China's importers for the fall in silver.

With limitations, China can replace certain quantities of imported products by domestically manufactured commodities. Undoubtedly there will be an increasing tendency to revert to some of the less desirable native products, where the cost of imported articles proves too high to meet the purchasing power of Chinese consumers. The country, however, only recently has embarked seriously upon the development of modern industries. The internal disorders from which it has suffered in the past 15 or 20 years naturally have deterred progress. Even were China able to take advantage of the greatly increased prices of imported articles to encourage domestic industry, it would still be necessary to import the machinery and equipment needed for the new plants.

One should bear in mind, however, that where the masses are favored with good crops and conditions permit them to realize well on these crops, the purchasing power directly concerned is greatly enhanced and can stand certain advances in the prices of commodities imported from abroad which have come to be looked upon as necessities. Furthermore, although the numbers of wealthy individuals in China are small as compared with the population in general, yet these numbers are of great consequence to China's import trade, as they aggregate a very considerable public possessed of a relatively high purchasing capacity. One has only to inspect the stocks carried by the big Chinese department stores in Shanghai, Hong Kong, and Tientsin, to appreciate the large market apparently offered for certain products imported from abroad which in China may be termed rightly "articles of luxury character."

Probably the most dangerous aspect of a continuation of low silver is the encouragement which this condition will offer to the idea of substituting price for quality considerations in China's trade. In the past the trade-mark, or chop, represented an important factor in the sales of foreign goods in China. American goods to a considerable extent fell within the category of quality rather than price commodities. Of course this was not the case with such staple commodities as kerosene, tobacco, lumber, cotton, and certain metals, which comprise the vast bulk of America's trade with China. On the contrary, cheaper and inferior substitutes of the many quality-manufactured goods which are imported into China can scarcely fail to result from a continuation of low silver levels. This will mean that American manufacturers will be obliged to exercise unusual vigilance to protect their trade-marks against cheap and inferior products placed upon this market under imitated trade-marks.

POSSIBLE CHINESE COMPETITION WITH GOLD-BASIS COUNTRIES

As for export trade, stabilized silver at low levels theoretically reacts favorably upon China's sale of commodities abroad; but if those who normally purchase are in the market for a considerably less quantity because of unfavorable economic conditions in their respective countries, China's export trade will suffer. Should the world-wide economic depression improve and silver levels continue low, China stands to profit, and in some instances may cut in sub-

stantially on the export trade of other countries with similar commodities but working on a gold basis. For instance, during the past few months China has been a heavy importer of cocoons from Japan, something unprecedented in the history of China's foreign trade. Should present silver levels continue, it is conceivable that China ultimately might make important inroads in Japan's export trade in reeled silk. Thus, should silver exchange become stabilized at low levels marked readjustments are of possible development in both China's imports and exports, and, in the event of improvement of internal political conditions, a very considerable impetus may be given to the development of domestic industry. Chinese possessed of large silver holdings have under present conditions in China, very restricted outlets for investment. One of the most popular of these is in real estate in the foreign settlements in Shanghai, where land values continue to advance with the ever-expanding growth and continuous building activity of this great commercial metropolis.

The most promising aspect in the trade situation in China for the present year lies in the good crops which the country generally enjoys. These, upon the whole, are better than China has had for some years. It is particularly fortunate at present, for were China obliged to import foodstuffs as heavily this year as in the past few years the low purchasing power of silver would make heavy inroads upon the resources of the country.

[From Mining Truth, Spokane, Wash., January 8, 1931]

WORLD NEEDS STABILIZED COINAGE—INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT MUST ESTABLISH UNIVERSAL MONEY—SUGGESTED TABLE MADE PUBLIC IN SPOKANE THIS WEEK

By P. A. O'Farrell

In stabilized metallic money, democracy will find the gospel of economic salvation.

An international monetary congress must stabilize the price of 23 grains of fine gold and 276 grains of fine silver at \$1. It must also stabilize 4.6 grains of platinum and 9.2 grains of palladium at a parity to 23 grains of gold. Also it must stabilize 2.5 grains of silver alloyed with 57.5 grains of bronze at 1 cent. This accomplished, the world will once more have a supply of stable and perfectly honest money.

WHAT IS MONEY?

Money, like density, momentum, and space is relativity, not matter.

Some may say this reconstruction of the world's monetary system is unnecessary, since paper money is so convenient and so cheap. In a few hours a billion dollars can be printed by a day laborer, but a billion dollars of silver, gold, and platinum costs a billion dollars in wages, supplies, and transport.

When Armageddon comes paper money will go up in smoke, like the Kaiser's billions of bonds and currency, but stabilized metallic money will outlast bolshevism and will serve a new world and a new civilization when they are born again.

The man who prefers a Bolshevik or Hindoo gold paper certificate to a stabilized silver rupee or rouble is little better than a fool.

INTERNATIONAL MONEY TABLE

In the following table is outlined a stabilized metallic currency for all nations:

Density:	
Silver.....	8.5
Gold.....	19.3
Palladium.....	12
Platinum.....	21.45
Valuation:	
Silver.....	1
Gold.....	12
Palladium.....	30
Platinum.....	60

Gold currency, 23 grains as unit or one gold dollar. Monetary gold is 23 grains of fine gold alloyed with 2 grains of bronze or \$1.

25 grains of monetary gold=\$1.
5 grains of monetary gold=1 franc, drachma, or lira.
250 grains of monetary gold=\$10 or £2.
125 grains of monetary gold=\$5.
500 grains of monetary gold=\$20.

Silver, 276 grains fine and 24 grains of silver-bronze alloy also \$1.

300 grains of sterling silver=\$1 or 1 tael.
75 grains of sterling silver=25 cents.
72 grains of sterling silver=a shilling or mark.
60 grains of sterling silver=20 cents, drachma, franc, or lira.
150 grains of sterling silver=a ruble, rupee, or yen.
180 grains of sterling silver=a half crown.
2.5 grains of silver alloyed with 57.5 grains of bronze=1 cent.
60 grains=1 cent.
120 grains=2 cents or an English penny.
300 grains=5 cents.

Platinum

23 grains=\$5.
230 grains=\$50.
460 grains=\$100.

Palladium

23 grains=\$2.50.
230 grains=\$25.
460 grains=\$50.

IDENTIFYING SYMBOLS

Only \$100 platinum and \$50 palladium coins should be minted. The platinum money might have the image of a bear to show its Russian origin. The palladium coin might be half-moon currency.

The ruble, rupee, and yen might have the image of a tiger on the reverse side, regardless of the nation which issued it. The eagle would naturally be the \$20 gold piece. The shilling and mark should be changed to a 25-cent coin, and a harp on the reverse side would be a suitable engraving.

The 20-cent silver coin might have the image of Homer, since the drachma and franc are of Greek origin.

The dollar, tael, and crown should be made equal and have the image of a lion engraven on each.

Gradually all nations would come to know the different coins by the image they bore.

SCRAP DEBASED COINAGE

A world's monetary conference need have no difficulty in stabilizing metallic money for all nations at the parity given. That accomplished, some six billion of debased bronze, silver, and brass currency would be scrapped and replaced by bronze and silver money equal to its face value.

The replacement money would not increase the silver and bronze currency of the world. It would, however, stabilize its value at \$6,000,000,000, or 60 per cent of the world's stabilized gold money.

In a century the sum of stabilized silver, platinum and palladium would not equal the stabilized gold currency which will then be in existence.

Thus, the stabilization of silver, gold, and platinum money will not increase the metallic money now in the world, although it will stabilize its value and its usefulness.

Stabilized metallic money will drive out of circulation the filthy microbe currency now in use in all countries, but especially in India.

METAL MONEY PRECEDES CIVILIZATION

Half-civilized peoples serve for wages paid in real money and not for cigarette-paper currency. The savage will give 12 hours' daily service for a beautifully engraved silver-bronze penny.

Engraved metallic money is the advance guard of civilization in lands now far beyond its frontiers.

Hence, stabilized, finely engraved bronze, gold, silver, palladium, and platinum is nature's own hand-painted money.

Let it not be forgotten that stabilized bronze currency, worth its face value in gold, is a thousandfold more serviceable to the whole human race than stabilized gold currency.

Bronze is the common currency of beggars and millionaires, and it is the currency which should be worth its face value in every mart, jungle, desert, and customhouse on earth.

ONE HUNDRED CENTS TO A DOLLAR

So should every silver coin in circulation. In other words, 100 bronze cent pieces should be accepted from China to Peru as change for 1 gold dollar. In like manner, 25 silver francs should be the exchange in all nations for the louis d'or, a sovereign, or a \$5 gold coin. When that is done gold can be called standard money, but until it is so called, the gold standard is not honest money.

The aim of monetary reformers is not to abolish gold as the standard of value, but to make it standard money. Gold is now as unstable as water, or as a reed shaken by every wind.

But when gold is linked with silver, platinum, and palladium at their relative marginal value, and when that relative marginal value has become an accepted convention or covenant by all civilized countries, the gold standard will cease to be a deceitful superstition and will become perfectly honest money.

SALVATION OF CIVILIZATION

Unstabilized gold and credit currency has wrought unparalleled misery and woe, and as certainly as night follows day it will destroy the world's civilization unless it is ended, and that soon.

Stabilized bronze, silver, palladium, platinum, and gold, as already stated, are nature's, or rather, with all due reverence, "God's own hand-painted money."

Unstabilized gold and unstabilized credit money, on the other hand, is the currency of His Satanic Majesty.

If democracy is to endure it must choose the money which has been so bountifully stored in the world's mines for the use and benefit of mankind, or else its doom is sealed and it will perish with the false prophets and high priests of finance who preferred the worship of mammon to the service of justice and truth.

PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL CURRENCY

The following table, presented by P. A. O'Farrell at the meeting of the Northwest Mining Association this week, shows a suggested method of stabilizing the world's currency. The column at the left gives the images which would be internationally used. No one country need coin all the denominations given, but every coin now in use in important countries is included in the table. As the international currency became better known, some of the present coins—such as the English pound—could be abandoned, just as many of the earlier American coins are no longer minted.

Denominator:	
Swan, 460 grains of platinum	\$100.00
Cuckoo, 460 grains of palladium	50.00
Eagle, 460 grains of fine gold, 40 alloy (monetary gold)	20.00
Camel, 460 grains of fine silver, 40 alloy (sterling silver)	1.66

Denominator—Continued.

Bull, 460 grains of bronze, 20 silver (1 ounce)	\$0.08
Sea gull, 125 grains of monetary gold	5.00
Goose, 120 grains of monetary gold (pound)	4.80
Lion, 360 grains of sterling (1 crown)	1.20
Buffalo, 300 grains of sterling silver	1.00
Lamb, 180 grains of sterling silver (half crown)	.60
Tiger, 150 grains of sterling silver (yen, rupee, ruble, peso, and florin)	.50
Fox, 75 grains of sterling silver	.25
Goat, 72 grains of sterling silver (shilling, mark)	.24
Hound, 60 grains of silver (drachma, franc, lira, peseta)	.20
Hare, 30 grains silver	.10
Wolf, 300 grains of monetary bronze	.05
Ass, 120 grains monetary bronze (English penny)	.02
Rabbit, 60 grains monetary bronze	.01
Bear, 30 grains monetary bronze (farthing, kopek)	.005
Mouse, 12 grains monetary bronze (centime)	.002
Rat, 6 grains monetary bronze	.001

What H. H. Stevens, domestic minister of trade and commerce, says in the following Ottawa dispatch, quoted in part from the Vancouver Sun:

"When attending the imperial conference Mr. Stevens addressed a British association of business men on the question of rehabilitating trade with the Orient and later had private conferences with bankers and captains of industry, both in London and New York, at which his ideas were set forth in greater detail.

"At these gatherings it was generally agreed that the world is not suffering so much from overproduction as from what Mr. Stevens described as 'maldistribution.' It is the conviction of those interested in reaching a solution of the economic ills now afflicting the world that if the two-thirds of the earth's population living in the Orient are placed in a position where they can become purchasers of what the other one-third have to sell, Canada, the United Kingdom, the United States, France, Germany, and other countries of Europe, will experience a prosperity previously unknown.

STUDENT OF SILVER QUESTION

"Mr. Stevens said yesterday that he did not wish to discuss living in the Orient are placed in a position where they can the matter officially as a member of the cabinet. But it was well known that he had been for years a student of the silver question in China, and he gave an outline of the basic ground of matters relating to the monetary system of China and what is involved in helping the millions of people in that country to a position where they will be potential customers of Canada.

"He recalled that some 40 or 50 years ago, when Britain and Germany decided to go on a gold basis, the bimetallic monetary system of China had to be abandoned and the people of China, who had their lifetime savings in hoards of silver, in silver bangles, bracelets, or leglets, had lost practically all they possessed when the price of silver collapsed.

"In their financial settlements with the nations of Europe the Chinese had to give 3 ounces of silver instead of 1, 3 hides instead of 1.

DEPLORED BY BALFOUR

"Lord Balfour, in a notable debate in the British House of Commons, had deplored the injustice, and Mr. Stevens had been told on his recent visit to England that the great statesman held the view that China had been wronged, and that some arrangement eventually would have to be made whereby China could return to the bimetallic monetary basis.

"The time has now arrived, it is believed, when the financial experts of the world's leading nations are prepared to bend their efforts toward restoring the economic equilibrium of China by a return to the former system of exchange.

"I think hostilities in China will cease at once if arrangements are made that will enable the armies engaged in warfare to follow peaceful pursuits," said Mr. Stevens.

"While the minister was speaking unofficially, he said the view had been expressed by noted economists and political observers that failure of the western nations to take a hand in the economic stabilization of the Orient would result in some form of sovietism eventually taking root in countries like China and India.

DEMONETIZATION A TRAGEDY

"Mr. Stevens is convinced that nothing would help Canada, Mexico, and the United States so much as the solution of the complex silver problem. The history of the demonetizing of silver was a tragedy. One billion people in the Orient, in China, in India, in the Malay States, and in Mexico had been deprived of two-thirds of their purchasing power by the action of the United Kingdom and Germany in adopting the gold standard. That was one reason for the agricultural and commercial depression which existed all over the world. One-half of the human race was living below the margin of what constituted a decent standard; millions were dying in China because of the inadequacy of their purchasing power."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I regret to be obliged to vote for this appropriation in the manner in which it has been presented to us. I wish it were possible.

for this money to be appropriated and to be spent through public agencies rather than through private agencies.

One would think in listening to the debate which has gone on in this Chamber that it was an unusual thing for the Federal Government to extend aid from Federal funds to the States and local communities. We accord aid, however, at every session of Congress, to various undertakings upon the part of the several States. For instance, we have appropriated repeatedly 50 per cent of the funds which are used by the various States in the building of public highways. We have an arrangement with many of the States to appropriate 50 per cent of their expenditures in carrying out the purposes and objects of the so-called maternity law. We appropriate 50 per cent of the money expended by the various States in the administration of vocational education. Surely if in time of peace we may go 50-50, so to speak, with the various States of the Union on public projects, which are not necessary, which are not essential and are not related to the existence of human life, we may in emergency in the effort to relieve poverty and human suffering cooperate with the several States to carry the heavy burden necessitated by this present great emergency.

I have opposed this plan of Federal aid in peace-time State activities, but it is in actual operation; and certainly it is justifiable in a great national calamity like the present, if it is ever defensible.

One of the reasons why we are confronted with this proposition at this time is because the administration has evidently felt from the outset that conditions throughout the country were not such as to make it necessary for any public funds to be used to relieve the want and suffering and poverty that exist. We all agree with the administration that if conditions were restricted to a limited area, if the emergency were not serious and grave, the proper thing to do would be to leave the work of relief to private agencies.

From the outset, however, the majority of the Senate have been of the opinion that conditions in the country call not only for all possible effort upon the part of private agencies to extend relief, call not only for all possible sacrifice and effort on the part of the local communities and States governments to cooperate and extend relief by appropriations of public funds in this emergency, but, as I have said, the majority of us have been of the opinion from the outset that the Federal Government itself ought also to cooperate and ought to contribute in the extension of relief at this time of great need because of extraordinary conditions.

It is because of the reluctance of the administration to accede to the extension of cooperative relief upon the part of the Federal Government and the stubbornness upon the part of the administration in opposition to appropriating funds in cooperation with the State governments and the local governments and in cooperation with private agencies that we are now confronted with the proposition in its present form.

Personally I wish that in this emergency we had applied the principle we have applied in time of peace when we have cooperated with States in helping them to carry exceptionally heavy burdens. On the theory that the States were poor, that they could not alone and of themselves carry the heavy expense of building highways, we have proposed to go 50-50, and on the theory that we ought to stimulate an interest in taking care of mothers and of children in infancy we have proposed a plan of 50-50 cooperation. In the existing circumstances of emergency, of want and of suffering, it seems to me we should have long ago said to the several State and local governments, "As in times past we have aided in the promotion of public activities in your jurisdiction, now, appreciating the burden that is upon the local taxpayers, we are willing to propose that the Federal Government pay 50 per cent of the increased cost, of the increased burden, of the increased appropriation necessary to extend what is popularly known as outdoor relief."

No suggestion of that kind has been made. If the majority party and the administration want to remove the Red Cross from this picture, remove any interference with the

Red Cross activities, and remove the objections that some of us have to giving public funds to private agencies, let them come here with a proposition that the Federal Government in this emergency shall do what it has done in times past, namely, cooperate with the States in appropriating 50 per cent of the increased additional expenses to remove poverty and suffering in this great emergency.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I have heard the suggestion of the Senator from other Senators. Let me inquire if the proposal to put the relief work under the States and have the Federal Government meet one-half the cost of the relief to be accorded would be acceptable? I had understood it would not be acceptable.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I should like to know what mayor or what board of selectmen or what official of any city in this country would refuse to remove from the backs of the taxpayers of the various communities 50 per cent of the additional burdens imposed by reason of this emergency.

I have repeatedly referred to the condition in my own community, which illustrates perfectly the frightful burden which local communities carry. At the present time in the town in Massachusetts where I live 975 persons out of a population of 13,000 are being fed and clothed daily, although the normal number each year is 50. In other words, the taxpayers of that community must this year provide by an increased appropriation enough funds to care for 975 persons as compared to the 50 persons usually taken care of. It must increase its normal public-welfare fund tremendously.

The taxes for outdoor relief in certain communities has increased from 400 per cent to 1,000 per cent. That has been going on in all the industrial communities and also in drought-stricken communities where suffering and poverty exist. It seems to me that we could relieve to a considerable extent the objections here did we propose a plan in this emergency of letting relief work be done by the local agencies and having the Federal Government go 50-50 with the States in appropriating the necessary funds.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I will yield to the Senator in a moment. In the very community where I live there is one official who is paid for his services who knows every poor person in the community, who personally goes out and solicits from private sources clothing and other essentials, and who applies, when necessary, the authority that is his to afford local relief in the way of a barrel of flour to a poor family, or a pair of shoes to a poor child, or a month's rent, or a ton of coal to a poor family. That, of course, has been the practice in most of the communities of the country for many years. I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. I was about to say that I would hesitate very much to have the Federal Government launch upon the project of taking entire charge of the situation, thus relieving local authority.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I agree with the Senator. I think it would be outrageous for the Federal Government to undertake to do the relief work that private agencies and local communities ought to do. I am only asking and only proposing, as I have done from the beginning, that in this emergency, because of the very heavy strain that has been put upon the various communities—an enormous strain in some communities—that we apply the principle of Federal relief to match local funds, on a 50-50 basis.

Mr. FESS. That would be very much less objectionable to me than the other plan.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Exactly. Such a proposal has been pending here since the early days of this session; it has been argued here on this floor, and that is why I am saying I am reluctantly favoring the amendment now under consideration, because I have no other alternative. Two things about this amendment are objectionable: First,

to take money from the public funds and give it to a private agency; and, secondly, to let the private agency administer the fund, when we have Government officials in every section of the country who are paid for such work and whose activities will not cost us a dollar.

By appropriating from the Public Treasury we will simply be saying, "Here is evidence of our good will and our desire to help, and here is evidence of our purpose to lessen the burden upon the local community."

I can not exaggerate the tremendous burden that has been imposed on some of the smaller communities which they will have to bear for years to come; and, bear in mind that, too, Mr. President, in a time of depression when property values are depreciated and when the tax burden will be heavier than ever. So it seems to me—and I felt it to be so from the outset—that if we are going to afford relief let us apply the principle we have applied in giving relief in peace times. We have heretofore given relief; it is not a new thing to aid the States; we have aided them in undertakings that were not one-tenth or one-millionth as important as the prevention of poverty, suffering, disease, and death. If there is any function of government that is more important than to protect the public health and relieve poverty and suffering I do not know what it is.

This whole controversy can be ended if the administration will come forward with some such plan as I have mentioned. Where the burden is not so extreme as it is in Arkansas and where, I doubt if the Government's appropriation could be matched on the 50-50 basis, it is possible some other proposition might be made. Surely in other parts of the country, however, this equal-ratio proposition could be met and would have two great effects. First, it would be dividing the burden between the local governments, the State governments, and the Federal Government; and, second, it would stimulate a fair degree of legitimate generosity upon the part of the local communities. The authorities in industrial communities, like Fall River, Mass., and in the drought-stricken counties of Arkansas, would feel that they could go forward to attack this serious problem with more courage and with more enthusiasm and with a knowledge that the whole burden is not to be local, but is to be shared in part by the Federal Government.

I feel very strongly that we can no longer justify a 50-50 policy on projects that are unnecessary and inconsequential compared to this, if we reject the proposal in a great emergency to relieve suffering and poverty from the Federal Treasury.

I have little hope, in view of the administration's position, of any such plan ever being worked out; however, if it could be, I would not vote for this immediate appropriation. The only suggestion has been made here that is likely to be adopted has been the one that has been attached to this bill in the way of an appropriation of \$25,000,000 to be given to the Red Cross to help lessen the burdens to the communities of this country in connection with extending relief. Therefore I very reluctantly have come to the conclusion, in the absence of something else, that I must vote for this.

I do not believe in the principle of giving Government funds to a private agency, be it as worthy and deserving and as honorable as the Red Cross. I regret it; but I do not care, either, to be put in the position that I do not propose to ask the Federal Government to do something in this emergency, because this is at least an effort to have the Federal Government to supplement private charitable agencies and to help relieve the burdens of the local communities. I shall, therefore, have to vote for it, in the absence of some other proposal.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I think there are many in the Chamber who would have preferred to have authorized a loan to the distressed farmers of the drought-stricken States. I believe that opposition to a loan to the farmers for food purposes arose entirely out of a lack of understanding of the ordinary customs and methods of doing business in most of the farm States where staple farm products are produced.

In the States, for instance, in which cotton is produced, practically without exception, food products are regarded as a part of the advances necessary in order to make crops. The farmer is not paid a daily or weekly or monthly wage. His income or wage is in his commodity, which is marketed periodically, and in the case of cotton annually. A loan for food to farmers engaged in the production of a crop of that character is exactly on the same basis as a loan to farmers for the purpose of purchasing fertilizer or any other necessary commodity for the making and harvesting of the crops.

Those who speak about loans to farmers upon their crops for the purpose of buying food with which to sustain the family labor under the impression that the farmers are paid substantially as laborers are paid engaged in industry. Quite the contrary is true, as all of us know who come from the States engaged in producing at least the staple agricultural products.

In my judgment, there was no sound reason why a loan to the farmers in the drought-stricken States might not have been authorized for the purchase of food for themselves and their families. That would have avoided the controversy that now has arisen in this matter.

If the loan had been authorized, if the administration had gotten behind the proposal to make the loan to the farmers for food purposes as well as for other necessary supplies with which to produce the crop, the Red Cross and other like organizations might well have been relied upon to take care of actual suffering in the industrial and commercial centers.

There is likewise a good reason why these organizations could have cared for such suffering as exists—and I have no doubt, from all the information we have received here, that the suffering is rather widespread—in the industrial and commercial communities; but we are foreclosed upon that question.

Twice the suggestion was made, and twice the Senate favorably considered the proposal, to include in the fund an item for food; and that could have been loaned to the farmer precisely upon the same security, precisely upon the same basis, precisely for the very same reason that fertilizers or feed for his animals or any other necessary article is advanced. In many agricultural States food is recognized as an advance for which the merchant or the landlord is given a lien upon the product of the farmer; and it stands altogether on the same basis as an advance to the farmer for the purpose of making his crop; that is, an advance of money with which to purchase necessary supplies. I think that should have been done; and then the organizations akin to or like the Red Cross could well have cared for, perhaps, the actual distress in the industrial and commercial communities.

One phase of the question has not been stressed, except by the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND]. He referred to health conditions in the country.

In nearly all parts of the agricultural South, including the States that were not visited by the drought, the health condition is an item that must be given close and careful attention. I dare say to-day that there is not sufficient medical attention, there is not sufficient care of the sick, in many of the agricultural States, due very largely not to a calamity such as the drought-stricken States have experienced but to a complete breakdown of the banking institutions and of the credit system in all of the agricultural States.

Mr. President, the point that is being overlooked in this discussion, as it seems to me, is that we are regarding this problem as one existing only in those States afflicted by a severe drought. It is true that that area presents the problem, and it is true that that is the field in which this relief is most urgently needed; but we are overlooking the fact that in a great agricultural country one calamity in one year so disorganizes the commercial and banking facilities of the country as to make it impossible for the country to take care of the distress and suffering visited upon the people. We are looking upon this situation as temporary. It is not

temporary at all. It is permanent, because if the policies that have led to the breakdown of the banking institutions, of the commercial structure, in the stricken States have brought us to the point where even a complete crop failure in one year brings such a condition of distress as to make it necessary to call upon the Red Cross or the State or the Federal Government to relieve it, there can be no reasonable hope that those policies, if pursued, will again enable agriculture to get back on a basis of profit or of independence.

The situation is that in a country with its elevators bursting with grain men and women are starving, according to the reports here; that in a country with a commodity out of which clothing is made in such a surplus or abundance that it can not be sold either at home or abroad, men and women and children are in actual need of clothing. In the maladministration, the maldistribution not only of our agricultural products, not only of wheat and of cotton but of the money of the country, is to be found a condition that indicates something more than a mere temporary situation, though, of course, I concede—and it is on that theory that we are acting—that the drought in certain States has produced such a condition, in view of the general economic breakdown of agriculture, that those States, either as States or local communities within the States, find themselves unable to relieve that situation.

Mr. President, to my mind it is most unfortunate that the Red Cross has been brought into this controversy. Nobody desires to criticize the Red Cross. I dare say all Senators would support it; but it is most unfortunate that it is brought into this controversy, and it does not require much discrimination to see and to appreciate the fact that it is the breastwork behind which the administration is making its fight on this legislation. That is the deplorable circumstance here; and if any culpability attaches to anyone, it is to the administration that would not permit loans to farmers because it was deemed an outrage to let them have money on which to live, but it was perfectly legitimate and a rightful function of government to let them have money with which to buy fertilizers or feed for their stock.

There has been a proposal made here, as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] pointed out, to meet appropriations from local communities and from States; but the President has not noticed that proposal, and the administration notices it now only because he is advised that the Congress has the mind to give relief, and to give it in the only available way that he has left open for the Congress to afford that relief.

Mr. President, have the States induced this calamity? To the extent that it is due to an act of God, to an unprecedented drought, surely the States have no more responsibility than the Federal Government. To the extent that the economic system has practically broken down in the agricultural sections of the country, the States have not induced that condition. But the policies pursued by the Federal Government have in a measure aggravated it.

I think it ought to be emphasized here and now that in a country as rich as the United States, with a farming population as independent and as courageous as any population within our borders, the farmers can not weather the losses of one season or of one crop, even with the assistance of their neighbors, then there is something wrong, radically wrong. The condition is not temporary, and the policies which have brought us to this point will not assist agriculture back to a condition of prosperity.

Mr. President, the administration is not willing to admit the facts. According to the administration, there was, first, no great unemployment in the United States; there was, second, no great distress in the United States; there is now no need of this legislation, because private charities will take care of the conditions existing in the agricultural sections.

It is tragic that in a country like ours, with the elevators fairly bursting with grain, as I have said, with more than half of the cotton crop undisposed of, a system of distribution such as we have nevertheless makes it impossible for

the agricultural States to meet all of their needs, even an emergency as great as this emergency, which has affected seriously, as the President himself says this morning, 21 States.

Why should we not pass this particular amendment to this bill? It is said it will embarrass the Red Cross. That is to be regretted, and to be profoundly regretted. But when did the Red Cross come into the picture? When did it issue its call for \$10,000,000? When was the committee organized to give force and power to that call? Who brought the Red Cross into this situation?

Mr. President, on the 3d of last July there was introduced in the House and in the Senate a resolution asking the President and the head of every executive department of the Government immediately to "begin the construction under the several acts of the Congress heretofore enacted authorizing the construction of public buildings and the prosecution of other public works and improvements throughout the United States" of such buildings and public works.

That was politics last July. It was the wicked suggestion of a Democratic Senator and a Democratic Member of the House—politics, pure politics, last July. Nothing was done. The situation was minimized, unemployment was said to be on the decline. Indeed, we were reminded again and again that it was not necessary to become disturbed over the situation. For years when anyone has made a plea for agriculture we have been reminded that it was the voice of the demagogue raised in this Chamber and the other House for political effect at home.

Within the 12 months past more than 900 banks have failed in the United States, with liabilities of almost a billion dollars. Large numbers of the failed institutions are in the agricultural States, and in the sections of the States devoted to agriculture.

Finally, when the farmer has exhausted his resources, his conserved capital, in the face of repeated warnings, we find the country in the midst of a general depression; and that depression is immeasurably worse because of the condition of the American farmer, and business will move forward with slower pace because of the condition of the American farmer.

It is desirable that the local communities and the States take care of this problem as far as possible. A reasonable loan to the farmers in the drought-stricken States would have been ample to have cared for them and left all other agencies free to care for the actual distress in the industrial and commercial communities in the United States.

It is not possible to remind the country of the actual conditions on the farm without arousing the resentment of the editors of the metropolitan press and most of the great business men of the country. They have reminded us again and again that we were preaching class doctrine in the United States. You can not take away from 6,000,000 men on the farm, with their families, the purchasing power which has been taken away from the American farmer, and maintain your industrial system in the United States.

We say we want to increase the purchasing power of the people, and so we do, but for 10 years the purchasing power of the American farmer has been constantly reduced, and finally his reserve capital has very largely disappeared, and the banks in nearly all parts of this country, where staple products are produced, have one by one, and even in twos and in dozens, gone down, until to-day there are not credit facilities available to the farmers in those States which are engaged in the production of staple products. Yet it is stated here that this condition is temporary. Temporary, yes; but it is a condition which we will endure for more than a passing year unless something is done for agriculture. It is a condition not induced by the action or non-action of the States. It is a condition which lies beyond the power of the States. It is a condition which is directly traceable to the national policy followed by this administration, and followed in the face of all disinterested advice which could be offered the administration.

It does not make any difference, of course, why the condition, if it exists, if the magnitude of it demands relief, and if it is a condition which can not now be relieved by the local community. Certainly there has been reasonable opportunity to the local communities to meet the situation adequately, and if the reports coming out of the drought-stricken States be correct, if they are at all true, the situation there has not been adequately met thus far, although the opportunity has been afforded to the agencies of those States to meet the present condition.

No attack is made upon the Red Cross. There is every desire that the local communities, first, with and through their organizations, the local government, second, even the States—though they have in no sense induced this condition—should first apply themselves to the relief of this particular problem; but when every suggestion which could be offered has been steadfastly refused by the administration, by our friends across the aisle, until we have arrived at this amendment upon this general appropriation bill, it seems to me that it is now time for the Senate and for the Congress to act in the matter.

There is assuredly no purpose to embarrass anyone; but I would be untrue to myself, I would feel I was derelict to the highest obligation resting upon me, if I did not say, and say without fear, that this is not a temporary condition. The present manifestation of it is temporary, but it is a fundamental condition, and it exists because of the policies, not of the States, but because of the policy of the Federal Government, to the full extent to which governmental policy has affected this problem or can affect this problem.

In one instance only may the States be said to be culpable, and that is with reference to taxation, the laying of higher and heavier taxes upon the farmer. Even the Government at Washington is not wholly blameless in that regard, because we have induced the States by 50-50 propositions to engage in all manner of enterprises which either their judgment or their financial ability seemed at the time at least to dictate to the States not to undertake.

Here is a great calamity present in 21 States, a large area in itself. There is, I dare say, ample opportunity for the Red Cross and every other like organization in every American city and every great industrial community, in every place where the commerce of this country is carried on, to exert itself to the utmost, and there was, when this session of Congress convened, a crying and pressing need from a large agricultural section in the country.

The 50-50 proposition was rejected. A loan proposal was rejected because it was deemed unsound. So far as the farmer is concerned, whose labor is a commodity because he must sell his products, whatever our friends in organized industry have otherwise been able to do in that regard, food stands just as any other necessary supply or material. If the farmers can not get aid in the drought-stricken States at this particular time without a call upon the charitable institutions of the country I shall not find it in my heart to vote against the amendment, though I would infinitely rather vote for a loan. If upon principle a loan for fertilizer or for seed or for livestock can be justified as consistent with the proper aims and purposes and functions of Government, then a loan for food for the farmer and his family who till the soil is justified upon precisely the same ground.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this morning the point of order made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] against my motion to postpone consideration of the Robinson amendment was held to be in order, and I think the ruling of the Chair was correct on the wording of the unanimous-consent agreement. But now, in order to secure an expression of opinion on the part of the Senate upon the same proposition, I offer and send to the desk the following amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. I ask that my amendment to the amendment may be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 11, add the following proviso:

Provided, however, That this appropriation shall take effect only if the American National Red Cross shall have been unable, before February 9, 1931, to secure voluntary individual subscriptions aggregating at least \$10,000,000 as the result of the appeal now being made for funds to meet the present emergency.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I would like to submit some observations before I cast my vote upon the amendment or the amendment to the amendment. I look upon the situation growing out of the drought extending through 21 States as I would upon an earthquake or any other cataclysm superinduced by the elements. I have no trouble, therefore, in supporting an appropriation to take care of the drought victims, if we may so refer to them. I should have preferred to see the amendment limited in its operation to those who are suffering from the drought, just the same as we take care of those who are the victims of a storm or fire or earthquake. There could be no objection to it on the ground of precedent and it would be establishing no undesirable precedent.

Furthermore, I am of the opinion that the \$10,000,000 which the Red Cross is proposing to raise by voluntary contributions, if the drought sufferers are left to be taken care of from it, will be a very inadequate sum with which to deal with the situation. It will in no sense meet the call of those who are on the verge of starvation. When we take into consideration that the drought extended over 21 States, affecting large portions of some of those States—in some of them almost the entire State—and the number of people who are therefore left in a condition where they can not care for themselves, and then take into consideration that there are from 5,000,000 to 7,000,000 unemployed people in the United States outside of that situation to which I have referred, it seems to me that we have wholly underestimated the amount necessary to take care of the situation as it now presents itself to us.

If we should have confined our appropriation to the drought region and taking care of those who should have help in those regions, the Red Cross would still have all that it could possibly do, in my judgment, to meet the situation in the country. It is a grave question in my mind whether the Red Cross could meet the problem adequately, even with the drought region left out. To undertake to meet a national calamity of this proportion with \$10,000,000 is almost trifling with human life.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it has seemed to me that the Red Cross officials have not, for some reason or other, properly appreciated or measured the suffering in the drought-stricken States. I have assumed it was for the reason that they realized their limitations in the amount of money which they had to take care of the situation; but for some reason or other certainly they have not adequately met the problem as it is in those States. The correspondence which I have had from some of those States and from individuals, some of whom I happen to know and others whose views by reason of their position I have reason to accept, indicates that even after the survey was made by the Red Cross the conditions as they were left were almost as deplorable as they were before. One gentleman, a business man, writing me advised me of some 50 children within the range of his personal knowledge who, after the situation had been taken care of or supposedly taken care of by the Red Cross, were in a condition of want and utter misery by reason of their lack of food and clothing. In the very wake of the efforts of the Red Cross was to be found the most widespread and poignant misery and suffering.

I do not mean to say, of course, that the Red Cross is indifferent to suffering or indifferent to these conditions, but I have assumed that by reason of the stupendous task which had been imposed upon them they have had to take only the most desperate conditions and deal with them. I verily believe that unless the Congress assists and aids in the situation, even though the Red Cross raises the \$10,000,000 for which it has asked, the Red Cross will not be in a position to take care of the work as it ought to be taken care of.

Secondly, I would have preferred and would prefer now to vote for this money as a loan to the Red Cross. I dislike to

vote for an appropriation direct to the Red Cross. I think it may have a very unfortunate effect upon the Red Cross in the future. But I do not feel that the Congress is wholly to blame for the situation in which we find ourselves. In fact, I do not believe that it is to blame at all, for if we take the statement which came to us days ago as to the situation as the Red Cross saw it at that time and as to their means to take care of it, and then measure what they proposed to do by what now we know actually has to be done, there was nothing that the Congress could do but take hold of the problem. If there had been a proper appraisal of it in the beginning, if the effort had been made to meet the situation as the situation existed, I have no doubt the Congress would not have undertaken to make any appropriations whatever. But here we are with millions hungry and unemployed, and we are asked to cease our efforts because it may be possible to raise ten million—an amount wholly insufficient.

Mr. President, we have to deal with the situation as it is. The real objection which has been made to the appropriation from the beginning is an objection which will not be removed on the 9th of February. The arguments which have been presented to us from the beginning will be as cogent and as powerful on the 9th of February as they are to-day.

The able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] read President Cleveland's message to Congress. President Cleveland was a very great President, greater in the minds of many people at this time than he was while he was President; but he was a great character and a great President. But the Congress has long ago rejected Mr. Cleveland's theory as impracticable and unsound under all the conditions which has from time to time confronted us. He was advising against an appropriation for seed. Long since we have rejected that principle. He was objecting to it upon the ground that the Constitution gave no authority for appropriating money for that purpose. The Constitution will not be changed between now and any time at which we are going to take care of the present situation—certainly not by February 9. The reasons for Mr. Cleveland's position have all been answered by the precedents which we have been compelled to establish, and furthermore by the fact that if we have to meet this matter upon February 9 we will meet it with the same constitutional objection precisely that we have to meet it to-day.

But, as much and as profoundly as I admire the character of Mr. Cleveland, I do not accept his view of the question. Of course, it is the business of the people to support the Government and not the business of the Government to support the people in the ordinary acceptance of that principle. But there comes a time when a government which would not protect its protectors, when they have been visited by a calamity over which they have no control, would be a disgrace to the map of the world.

When a condition confronts the people of a country, over which neither government nor man has any control, there must be a combination of citizens and government in their efforts to meet the situation; and that is precisely what we are undertaking to do now. A drought swept over 21 States. It has left the people almost depleted as to means by which communities ordinarily take care of themselves. To say that a government, in the absence of organization that can take care of it, would not take care of it, would, in my judgment, be an impeachment of the government itself. No one desires to supplant the voluntary organizations; no one desires to hamper them in their work; but, when we are faced with the proposition that a task has been presented to them which they have not met and, in my judgment, can not meet, it is the duty of the government to take cognizance of it, and to help meet it. No, sir, Mr. President, I will never accept the doctrine that it is not the business of government to feed its people when, through the forces of nature, they have been brought to starvation and disease. This Government never has accepted any such principle, and it never will.

Therefore, whatever the precedents may be, they must be construed in the light of the facts with which we have to deal to-day. I would have no hesitancy whatever, I would feel I was clearly within sound principles, in voting for an appropriation to take care of the victims of the drought; and it would suit me much better if the amendment were in that form. But as it is, and as it is now presented to us, I must vote as best I may to assist those in dire distress. I venture to say that before the unemployment ends in the United States the \$10,000,000, which the Red Cross is seeking to raise, and the \$25,000,000, which we are going to appropriate, will have been exhausted without any waste of any part of the contribution. I do not believe the \$35,000,000 will be any too much to take care of the present conditions. I would rather have had the amount divided, but in the sum total it will not be more than is absolutely necessary.

Mr. President, think of five to seven million unemployed people and their dependents, reduce to the lowest limit the amount upon which they can live daily, and how long would \$10,000,000 last? When is the condition of unemployment going to end? Then think of the fact that in the 21 States there are whole communities which have been robbed of their capacity to take care of themselves; and we must reach the conclusion that, while \$25,000,000 seems in ordinary times and under ordinary circumstances a large sum of money, \$25,000,000, in the face of the distress in 21 States, and with from five to seven million unemployed, with their dependents, is a very reasonable sum of money to be appropriated to meet this emergency.

Mr. President, I presume under the amendment as it is presented, and under the unanimous-consent agreement, there will only be two propositions presented: First, the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] to postpone it; and, secondly, the amendment itself, in case the motion shall be defeated.

Mr. President, I shall not vote, under the circumstances, to postpone it. If we postpone it under the conditions prevailing, we are saying to the voluntary contributors of the country, "If you do not raise this money by the 9th of February we shall take care of the situation." If it be true there are those who feel, by reason of the drain which has been put upon them in their communities, that they have made all the contribution they reasonably can, and if it is that class of people with whom we are going to deal, they will feel that the 9th of February is not far off and they can postpone their contribution for two weeks just as readily as if the Federal Government shall contribute \$25,000,000 and they are convinced that there is no necessity for the \$10,000,000; but if there is in the minds of those people any conception whatever of the real situation which confronts the country, the fact that Congress is contributing \$25,000,000 will not cause them to hesitate a moment to add to it to take care of suffering and distress. We will need every cent of \$10,000,000 after our appropriation is made.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COUZENS in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. FESS. The Legislature of Ohio is now in session, and is considering the question of relief because of the condition of our people in the southern portion of the State. I think the legislature will go ahead with the matter and do their duty. I am wondering what effect congressional legislation will have upon the States generally if we shall proceed on the basis of doing what I think the State themselves ought to do?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, of course I do not know what the State of Ohio may do whether we act or whether we do not act; but, as I look at it, we can not wait upon one another. The people are hungry; the situation is imminent. I do not feel like waiting. The State of Ohio, the Red Cross, and all have had ample time to have acted up to the measure of the task in view of the calamity which really confronts us. I repeat—I wish I could think other-

wise—that before we are through with this depression and the condition of unemployment the States, the Red Cross, and the National Government will all not have done more than is necessary to deal with the existing emergency. Has the Senator from Ohio undertaken to estimate what it would require to take care of from five to seven million unemployed for the next three or four months?

Mr. FESS. I should hope that we might be able to find work for them rather than to undertake to feed them.

Mr. BORAH. I, too, would hope so; but I see little prospect of taking care of more than a small number of them in that way.

Mr. FESS. I think the Senator from Idaho recognizes the situation I have in mind, namely, that if the Federal Government shall not do so, the States otherwise will easily take care of their own, but they would say, "If you are going to distribute funds, we want our share." I feel that that is the situation we are facing.

Mr. BORAH. Would the Senator suggest that we wait upon the action of the Legislature of the State of Ohio?

Mr. FESS. No; I would suggest that we give a reasonable time to ascertain whether relief can not be afforded through the regular organization now existing, but if it shall not, I shall join the Senator from Idaho in voting for the appropriation.

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President, no doubt we have gotten ourselves all around into something of a jam—that is to say, the action of the Red Cross, the action of Congress, and the action of the legislatures may have their play upon one another—but I think the Senator from Ohio will agree with me that this entire situation arises out of the fact that the conditions were not properly measured in the beginning. The Red Cross, when it reported to us 10 days ago, had no suggestion about raising an additional dollar; it was going to take care of the whole situation with something like \$5,000,000. That is what Congress was advised.

Furthermore, we were not advised of the action of the States; we were not advised of any purpose upon the part of the wealthy of the country to guarantee the Red Cross's loans. So far as individual action was concerned, 10 days ago it was sterilized by the \$5,000,000 of the Red Cross, although \$5,000,000 would not take care of 25 per cent of the situation as it was then presented. Now we are in this condition, and I myself am not in favor of delaying longer in meeting the situation. I do not know whether the Senator from Arkansas has incorporated in the amendment the words which were suggested the other day, to the effect that if the money shall not be used, it shall be returned to the Treasury.

Mr. FESS. That provision is in the amendment.

Mr. BORAH. If it is in the amendment, what harm can it do the Red Cross for the National Government and the State governments through their legislatures all to move forward and take care of the most serious situation that has ever confronted the United States outside of war? The problem will call for the support of all.

Mr. FESS. Would the Senator feel free to give his opinion as to what effect this amendment, if it shall become a part of the law, will have on the efforts of the Red Cross to collect funds?

Mr. BORAH. I have no idea what effect it will have; I suspect it will have, in some respects, an unfortunate effect; but I have no means of knowing. If these were prosperous times, if the communities of the country had not drained men of means and of wealth to a tremendous extent already, if the local communities were not also calling for further help and larger donations, I should suppose that the Red Cross could raise ten or fifteen million dollars without any difficulty; but a gentleman who has been connected with the Red Cross as a solicitor for 15 years said to me Sunday two weeks ago that the situation was simply something that he had never experienced and never expected to experience; that there had been such a drain upon those who were asked to contribute in previous years that he did not know whether they could make any progress in raising a fund or not. That was before the \$10,000,000 was asked. I do not know and no one knows the exact condition; I only

know what the facts are which have come to me with reference to this situation; and I only know that, those facts being true, it is the business of somebody to take care of the distress and suffering now prevailing, and under the circumstances the Congress of the United States has its responsibility as well as the Red Cross. If \$10,000,000—

Mr. FESS. Knowing the Senator from Idaho as I do, knowing the integrity of his mind, I am sure that he looks with as much fear as I do on making the Red Cross the agency for the distribution of Federal funds appropriated out of the Federal Treasury. It may afford a precedent for a like action in the future; that is what I am afraid of.

Mr. BORAH. I should be very glad to see the amendment changed to provide that the money shall be distributed through officials and agents of the Government. Had I been offering the amendment, it would have been different in two important particulars.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. REED. Does not the Senator think that the amendment which I have just sent to the desk providing that the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas shall become effective only if the drive for \$10,000,000 shall fail offers a reasonable opportunity for the Red Cross to show what it can do in the way of obtaining funds by private subscription?

Mr. BORAH. I said a few moments ago—I am not sure whether the Senator was present—that I do not think \$10,000,000 will by any means meet the situation. If I could see \$15,000,000 appropriated for the drought victims, and then \$10,000,000 were raised by the Red Cross, I would feel that the situation had been met according to principle and precedent; but if we rely upon \$10,000,000 to take care of the conditions of distress in the drought-stricken States, and to take care of the suffering growing out of unemployment, just so sure as time goes on we are going to be without means to feed those who will be in want.

Mr. REED. I grant that; but if \$10,000,000 can be raised in the next three weeks by an appeal for voluntary subscriptions, if present unfortunate conditions continue, as perhaps they may, for a considerable period after that, it seems to me self-evident that a further drive will easily be possible. There is lots of money left in this country, and people have not ceased to be generous.

Mr. BORAH. There is a great deal of money left in the country, and I do not claim that the American people have ceased to be generous; I think wealth has been exceedingly generous in the country as a whole, and I think it has been generous in the various communities; but we have telegrams, any number of telegrams—I suppose almost every Senator has received such telegrams—from mayors and other officials and individuals in their States to the effect that the local resources have been drained; that they can not meet the Red Cross obligation, and so forth. How widespread that condition is we do not know, but we know it exists. I do not accuse anyone of lack of generosity, but I know that there are men in the country who were worth millions upon millions two years ago who are having difficulty now in keeping their houses open.

I am not so sure, Mr. President, that conditions in this country are now such that we have the same right to call upon those contributors that we would have had two years ago. So the question recurs whether, in view of the general depression which has reached the rich as well as the poor, we are going to meet the situation solely by voluntary contributions or whether the Government has not, under the circumstances, a duty to perform. I should like to see it confined to the drought-stricken regions, and then the Red Cross will have every reason in the world to go ahead. There is not a man in the United States with sufficient intelligence to have made a million dollars who does not know, if he examines into the facts, that every cent of the \$10,000,000 will be necessary in addition to whatever the Government shall contribute. We are not going to be out of this depression in four months. We may ameliorate it; I

trust we shall; it may modify itself; I trust it shall; but we know perfectly well that during the coming summer there will be unemployment which somebody will have to take care of. The Congress will be gone, and there will be sufficient demand upon the generosity of those who feel able to give to take care of the situation when the time comes and Congress is not here.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas obtained the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, in order that I may have read at the desk a letter in regard to the very matter now under discussion? I think it is a very informative and excellent letter.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

BROWNSVILLE, TENN., January 17, 1931.

HON. JERE COOPER,
Senator K. D. McKELLAR,

Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I am writing you with regard to drought-relief measures that are now being considered and have been passed in Congress. We notice that arrangements have been perfected to open headquarters in Memphis to expend funds in surrounding territories adjacent to Memphis. We want to call to your attention and clearly show to you the present conditions of the people of Haywood County, Tenn., and surrounding counties.

I do not believe that there is any section of the South that is any more in dire need than Haywood County. Up to January 1 the local Red Cross cared for and practically maintained some 500 families in this county who were absolutely destitute, both as to food and clothing, and in fact were in a condition where they would have suffered greatly without this relief. Our Red Cross fund has been exhausted and we have gone as far with local relief as it is possible for us to go as the people here are not in a position to make any further contributions as all of the people are so affected that they feel that they have already made a great sacrifice in the contributions that they have made, and that they have gone as far in their contributions and donations as they can possibly go. And unless we do get some relief through the Federal Government or otherwise I do not know what the people in this section are going to do. The winter is not ended and they have no provisions or clothing and are in no position to get any credit, and the merchants who have heretofore been extending credit have gone as far as they can go and have even extended their credit to the point where they have become seriously embarrassed, so the result is that it is imperative that this section of our State receive its full consideration and just dues in the distribution of any relief that the Government may give, or that may be provided otherwise.

I have been in close touch with the extension forces of the State, especially with Mr. Nichols, of the western division, and we have a temporary drought-relief organization set up in this county which can function on short notice. We know that the \$45,000,000 of relief is to be used only for the purpose of purchasing feed, seed, and fertilizer. It is true that thousands of head of stock are now dying in this county and for lack of feed, and we do not in any way discourage this form of relief as we think it is good and should be available, but of as equal importance in our opinion is some relief to the people, as we do not know what is going to become of these eight hundred to a thousand families in this county who are now in distress, and this number will be increased as time goes on.

We want you to bear these facts in mind, and in any relief of any nature that is set up by the Federal Government or by any other agency see that west Tennessee, including Haywood County, receives its just proportion of the distribution of this relief, both as to stock and as to the people themselves.

We appreciate the fact that you have always been in the interest of our people, and we know that you will do all that can be done for us, and we are giving you this information so that you may thoroughly understand just what the conditions are here. We notice from the papers that there is considerable publicity from some sections, particularly Arkansas and parts of Mississippi. We have had no publicity policy or campaign in our county, and for this reason our distress may be underestimated by the general public, but what we have stated in this letter is exactly the true facts in the case and can be corroborated by anyone you desire to question. Just to illustrate our condition, we had an incident happen at Stanton, in this county, that, so far as I can remember or have ever heard of, has never occurred before. One of the local merchants at Stanton had huge pots filled with beef bones and some meat and vegetables, making a stew, which was served free to the people, and there was a long line of people who were only too glad to take advantage of this opportunity to get food. This event occurred right in the heart of Stanton, and, as you know, Stanton is located in one of the best agricultural sections and composed of some of our most substantial citizens and people who would generously contribute to any relief, and they have done so in 1930, just as far as their means would permit.

With kindest regards, I am, yours very truly,

GEO. W. MEUX.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, Doctor Meux is one of the strongest and best men in Tennessee, and what he says may be absolutely relied on. The situation he depicts is absolutely correct. It is indeed deplorable, and shows the necessity of adopting this amendment.

I am of the opinion that we can not hope to get relief from the Red Cross alone. The Government must do its part. Any government which will not come to the relief of its citizens under these circumstances is a poor government.

We have furnished the money before. There is ample precedent for the proposed action. It is our duty to act, and act at once.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. I have not joined in this discussion for the reason that those who were more immediately affected were more accurately informed; but I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that early in the fall of last year, when this disaster became known, the executives of these several States were asked, through the administration, to meet and canvass the situation and recommend to Congress the extent of the disaster, and what, in their opinion, would be the sum necessary to meet it. I am speaking now of the drought-stricken region and not of the question of unemployment.

According to the testimony brought before our committee, the governors of the several States affected by this drought estimated that \$60,000,000 would be necessary to meet the exigency that was then existing. Now, Mr. President, what we have discovered to the public as legislators on a disaster borders on the ridiculous.

As I said, the question came up before us that \$60,000,000 was necessary. The Senate passed the \$60,000,000. The President of the United States, as I understand, recommended, through the information gathered from the Budget, that \$25,000,000 would be enough. The House raised that amount to \$30,000,000. Therefore the question before the conferees, of whom I was one, was whether the \$60,000,000 voted by the Senate was necessary. All the evidence that we had disclosed the fact that perhaps that was not enough to meet the unprecedented calamity that had befallen 21 States. The conferees from the other body were as stout in their contention that \$30,000,000 was sufficient. We compromised on \$45,000,000.

As the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has pointed out, the word "food" could have been incorporated in the \$45,000,000 appropriation, as it was the customary thing for the farmers, in making arrangements for their annual budget, to include food along with feed and fertilizer and other elements. That was voted down, but we passed the \$45,000,000 appropriation. The junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] had insisted that \$15,000,000 should be incorporated in the measure for the purpose of supplying food. The Red Cross informed us that it was not necessary at all.

The senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] then introduced a measure appropriating \$25,000,000, including unemployment as well as food for the drought-stricken regions; and immediately the Red Cross supplemented that by saying that it would be necessary for them to raise \$10,000,000.

Mr. President, every man here is convinced that an unprecedented condition exists. As the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has pointed out, we do not know what the end of this matter will be; and though I deplore the fact that we have here a measure to turn over this appropriation to the Red Cross, yet it is the only chance we have now. I should infinitely rather have had the amount appropriated devoted to the drought-stricken regions and administered by our own forces; but this is the only chance for immediate relief, and people are in need of immediate relief. Every single position taken by the House and by the administration and by the Red Cross has been abandoned, until now they are all agreed that this emergency is on. I maintain that all those who are in favor of relief should vote for this measure.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I want to say just a word in behalf of the Indians who are in need of the same kind of relief that is proposed here for others.

Practically every day since this session began I have received from one to many letters from various Indian reservations throughout the Nation, stating that on account of drought their conditions this year are harder than they have been for many, many years. On Saturday I received a letter from an old-time missionary who has been with the Indians since away back at the beginning of this century, and knows them very well. He says he visited, on the part of his reservation with which he has to deal, 125 families in the last three weeks, and he states that poverty reigns supreme; that there is absolute necessity for food and clothing for those Indians.

I am satisfied that the Indian Bureau can not take care of the situation. They have many of the so-called citizen Indians or unrestricted Indians. The Department of the Interior, the Indian Bureau, feel that it is not their place to take care of that class of Indians; and there are many of them who must be taken care of by the Red Cross and other charitable organizations.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, the fundamental vice in the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] is that it is based on an erroneous impression, as stated by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], namely, that \$10,000,000 in addition to the funds that the Red Cross now has expended are adequate for the requirements of the conditions to which relief measures are being addressed.

Mr. President, there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that all that the Red Cross can raise, whether \$10,000,000 or more, and the appropriation that is now the subject matter of discussion, will be required within the next three or four months if fair measures of relief are carried forward.

No one desires to hamper the Red Cross. The adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania is an implied pledge that if the \$10,000,000 be not raised in full, the Congress will then do what it ought to have done a month ago, namely, make a more liberal provision.

Every Senator would like to see the Red Cross drive succeed. However, the implication in the President's statement published this morning, that it is unsound policy for the Government to make appropriations for the relief of its citizens in times of disaster or widespread distress, prompts a review of the facts and incidents of controlling importance.

It will be remembered that several months prior to the beginning of the present session want and suffering due to Providential causes became quite general in many States; the Senator from Idaho stated, 21 States. When the Congress convened, the President was appealed to by many Members and by private citizens to take the initiative. The Red Cross, with no comprehension whatever of the magnitude of the task, began operations, but admittedly failed to meet the imperative requirements of the situation. Mr. Payne, the active head of the Red Cross, advised President Hoover—who is also president of the American National Red Cross—that the organization was taking care of the situation, and would continue to do so; that ample funds were in hand to carry on through the winter. Within three days it was announced that a call would be made for \$10,000,000 to supplement the funds in hand.

In the meantime the Senate had twice voted loans for food, mark you, based on the same security that is to be accepted as loans for seed, feed, and fertilizer; and the loans for food were to be limited in the aggregate amount.

With unaccountable stupidity, this legislation was denounced as a dole and rejected; and everywhere we hear highbrows declaring their opposition to the dole, just as if a charity from the Government is any more a dole than a charity through the Red Cross. Of course, Red Cross dole is not Government dole; but any form of charity is a dole.

Meantime local conditions have been growing worse, and those needing assistance were rapidly increasing in number, so that it became apparent that very large sums are necessary. The President and the Red Cross did little, and would have continued that policy of doing the least possible had not the Senate of the United States taken the initiative and made a drive which has forced both the President and the Red Cross to a partial realization of the danger ahead.

Now, we hear that it is unsound policy to make appropriations from the Federal Treasury for the relief of peoples in widespread areas when local organizations are unable to meet the requirements. I want to call the attention of the Senate to the view expressed by the present President when he came before the committees of Congress appealing in the name of the Russian people, appealing in the name of the peoples of Europe, that the United States Government participate in feeding those peoples, and I wish to show that he thought then that the conditions were such that charitable organizations should not be even asked to carry on this task.

Appearing before a committee of the Senate in advocacy of the appropriation of a \$20,000,000 fund to be given as a charity to Russians suffering from hunger, and which he administered, our President said:

I feel that public charity will do everything that charity can do, but these are times when one can not rightly summon much public charity for use abroad from the American people. There are a great many committees working throughout the country under great difficulty but with a great deal of energy. I do not believe, however, that the total collections since August of the entire group amount to \$750,000. Public charity is to be not an avenue through which this problem can be solved.

Then, omitting a part of the statement, I continue the quotation:

It does not look to be a very great strain on the population to take \$20,000,000 for a purpose of this kind. If our own people suffer, we surely possess also the resources to care for them.

Mark you, the conditions were such that an appeal to charity could not be made. Our people, he said, had paid and contributed out of their generosity until they were no longer able to do so, but notwithstanding that fact it was sound policy then to reach a strong arm into the Federal Treasury and take \$20,000,000 of the money of the taxpayers of the United States and carry it to Russia, and spend it in relieving people who were suffering, who owe no allegiance to our flag, and who, as has been stated during the course of this debate, have no right of political appeal to the people of this country.

He said further, as appears on page 37 of the record to which I am referring:

To-day outside of Russia the administration has about four or five thousand children left on its hands in Poland and Austria, of which about 85 per cent of the cost is borne by local governments or local charity. Thus we were in position to make an effort in Russia and with the full approval of our Government the relief administration opened negotiations last August with the soviet authorities acting as a voluntary and informal body.

It is mysterious political philosophy to me that the President or anyone else familiar with the traditions and institutions of this country would seriously make an argument that it is sound policy to appropriate public money for the purpose of preventing the starvation of foreigners, but very unsound policy to use a dollar of the money contributed by the people of the United States themselves for their own relief.

On page 38 of the same record President Hoover, then Mr. Hoover, is reported as saying:

The problem that we are confronting is not a problem of general relief to Russia, for which there can be some criticism, but is a problem of relief to an area suffering from an acute drought. In other words, we are making a distinction here between the situation created by the hand of man as distinguished from the situation that might be called an act of God. This Volga area, as has been stated, is practically altogether an agricultural region.

I have not the time to give the emphasis the course of this debate would justify on that declaration by the present President. The case is exactly parallel, in many of its

features, with the issue now before the Senate of the United States. He justified then the appropriation of \$20,000,000 of public money for relief in a drought-stricken region in Russia, but now asserts it is unsound—strange philosophy, is it not, to appropriate public money for relief in a drought-stricken region in the United States?—

Then further, on page 39 of the same document, he is reported as saying:

I have a feeling we are dealing to-day with a situation of a great deal of depression and have a proper right to inquire not only whether we are doing an act of great humanity but whether we are doing an act of economic soundness.

Listen to that! The appropriation of \$20,000,000 of the money of the people of the United States for relief purposes in Russia was justified as sound in economics but any appropriation is condemned as violative of sound economics if made for the benefit of people who paid into the Treasury of the United States the money out of which the appropriation is to be made.

Reference has been made to the failure of the States and local communities to perform a fair share of their obligations in this season of great stress. I have already on other occasions indicated my sincere sympathy with any policy which will contemplate assistance and contributions on the part of the States and local communities.

Some newspapers have seen fit to try to inject into this controversy partisan questions which reflect on the integrity and honor of the States. I wish to point out the fact that in some of the States in the drought-stricken region there will be a moratorium as to taxes. That will be absolutely necessary because the people who are suffering this great misfortune will be unable to meet their tax obligations. Schools are being closed, and many institutions of public education and of other kinds are unable to continue performance of their very valuable functions in the communities which they serve. In addition to that, the agencies of the State governments, in some of the States, at least, will be very seriously hampered by reason of a cutting short of the revenues. Some of the States will have difficulty in carrying on.

Another assertion, which I think contemptible, in view of the history of those who have tried to inject it into this debate, is that the object of this amendment is to harass and embarrass the President, to discredit his administration.

There is not the slightest objection to anyone who is familiar with the course I have taken, characterizing anything I have done in any way he pleases. I am not in the slightest sensitive about it. It presents a pitiable spectacle of inefficiency and incompetency for months and months to do nothing, and then claim it is politics when some one tries to get action with which everyone in the Senate is in sympathy.

Partisan assertions intended to mislead the public mind into the belief that the strongly supported and highly humane drive in the Senate to authorize an appropriation of \$25,000,000 to the American National Red Cross for the purchase of food supplies with which to feed starving thousands in drought-stricken areas has for its controlling object the breaking down and discrediting of the Hoover administration display more animus than argument. An administration that shrinks from the ghastly presence of stalking famine confesses its own weakness and discredits itself in the eyes of the millions of people who would be touched with providing pity could they see for themselves the havoc and hunger in the woeful wake of the most devastating drought in the country's history.

There is no thought of discrediting the administration or in any other way embarrassing the President in the insistence upon immediate governmental action to save thousands of American citizens from the imminent tragedy of death from starvation through no fault or failure of their own. These unfortunate people had planted their crops and tilled their fields only to reap a harvest of horror such as never before confronted farm toilers on this continent.

With the situation daily and hourly growing in acuteness, assuming new aspects of terror and despair, there are Senators who would have the Government extend direct relief through the ever-helping hand of the American Red Cross, and for their attitude of pity they are accused of a sinister political purpose. The accusation is a mirage and a mockery.

Great in everything which supports greatness, the record of the American people teems with illustrations of their generosity and abundant charity in giving in response to human suffering. Likewise has the Government of the United States opened its purse time and again to appeals of stricken communities and nations for succor in the form of money appropriations for the purchase of food supplies.

Official records reveal that thirty-six times since 1812, when the American Congress voted \$50,000 for food supplies for the starving people of Venezuela, the Government has appropriated money with which to procure provisions for famine-stricken peoples in this and other lands.

The senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] said this morning that during recent years the United States had pursued exclusively the policy of relying upon the Red Cross and other charitable organizations for relief in times of widespread distress. Has the Senator from Pennsylvania forgotten that in 1928 the Army of the United States devoted approximately a million dollars of its resources to relieving conditions in Porto Rico? Has he forgotten that approximately \$10,000,000 of public money was made available for use in Porto Rico and, at the same time, while that sum was being employed, the Red Cross was carrying on its activities and receiving contributions? There is no more reason why that course could not be pursued now and the Red Cross carry on successfully its campaign for \$10,000,000, notwithstanding the purpose of Congress to attempt to make an appropriation, than there was in the case of Porto Rico.

It is mysterious beyond the power of the human mind to grasp that the Government as it is now being administered manifests such complete indifference toward the sufferings of its citizens.

In 1921 the American Congress unhesitatingly voted the sum of \$20,000,000 for food to relieve the starving millions of Russia, and immediately following the holocaust of the World War its sympathy for Europe's unhappy peoples took the tangible form of an appropriation of \$100,000,000. This vast sum of ready relief money was placed at the disposal of Mr. Herbert Hoover, our President, for disbursement, and instantly he assumed world-noticing proportions as "the man who fed starving Europe."

The late official reports received at the Washington headquarters of the American Red Cross suffice to impress deeper upon the hearts and minds of our people the suffering endured by thousands of helpless and all but hopeless men, women, and children as famine stalks undefied through pitilessly parched areas. To the Congress of the United States these terror-stricken people have turned their gaunt faces in the despairing hope that they may be saved, even at this late hour, from a fate which the Government has averted in foreign lands.

We are told in official news dispatches that starving refugees are fleeing from wrecked farms in the 21 drought States. Some were forced from their homes by relentless mortgage foreclosures, some were unable to pay rent, while others were moving South to escape the rigors of a winter against which they have no means of preparing. In one State the situation was not inaptly compared to the "dreadful fog of Belgium, settling and obscuring sunshine and happiness."

It is in the face of this tragic situation that many Senators are seeking to have the Congress reveal the great and, in times past, pitying heart of the Government. To accuse them of playing politics to embarrass the administration is to make light of the agonized suffering of thousands of human beings reduced to poverty and misery by a fearful visitation.

If there is any doubt as to the right of the Congress to take this course and use such portion of the public funds

as is necessary to sustain the lives of its citizens, then I ask, What happened in the case of Belgium and other European nations when we devoted \$100,000,000 to sustaining life and providing comfort to the peoples of foreign lands? What happened in the case of Russia? If it was sound policy in those instances to use public money, not lavishly, not extravagantly, but as the circumstances required, how much more the argument applies in cases like the present.

The VICE PRESIDENT (at 4 o'clock p. m.). The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], which will be reported.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I ask leave to strike out of my amendment the parenthetical clause.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator modifies his amendment. Let the amendment to the amendment be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] offers the following amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]: On page 1, after line 11, add the following proviso:

Provided, however, That this appropriation shall take effect only if the American National Red Cross shall have been unable, before February 9, 1931, to secure voluntary individual subscriptions aggregating at least \$10,000,000 as a result of the appeal now being made for funds to meet the present emergency.

Mr. REED. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll on the suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Frazier	La Follette	Shortridge
Barkley	George	McGill	Simmons
Bingham	Gillett	McKellar	Smith
Black	Glass	McMaster	Smoot
Blaine	Glenn	McNary	Steiwer
Borah	Goff	Metcalf	Stephens
Bratton	Goldsborough	Morrison	Swanson
Brock	Gould	Morrow	Thomas, Idaho
Brookhart	Hale	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Broussard	Harris	Norris	Townsend
Bulkley	Harrison	Nye	Trammell
Capper	Hastings	Oddie	Tydings
Caraway	Hatfield	Partridge	Vandenberg
Connally	Hawes	Patterson	Wagner
Copeland	Hayden	Phipps	Walcott
Couzens	Hebert	Pine	Walsh, Mass.
Cutting	Heffin	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Howell	Reed	Watson
Deneen	Jones	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler
Dill	Kean	Schall	Williamson
Fess	Kendrick	Sheppard	
Fletcher	Keyes	Shipstead	

Mr. WATSON. I desire to announce that my colleague, the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON], is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. REED. May my amendment to the amendment be read for the information of those Senators who have come in during the quorum call?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the amendment to the amendment again be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk again read the amendment to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENDRICK (when Mr. CAREY's name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] is unavoidably absent on official business. I am unable to state how he would vote if he were present.

Mr. WATSON (when the name of Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana was called). My colleague [Mr. ROBINSON] is necessarily absent on account of illness in his family.

Mr. STEPHENS (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. SWANSON (when his name was called). I have a pair this week with the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN]. I have been unable to obtain a transfer and therefore withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." If the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN] were present and not paired, he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BULKLEY (after having voted in the negative). I am advised that the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] is absent. As I have a pair with him, I withdraw my vote. If free to vote, I would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—30			
Bingham	Gould	Morrow	Steiwer
Dale	Hale	Moses	Townsend
Deneen	Hastings	Oddie	Tydings
Fess	Hebert	Partridge	Vandenberg
Gillett	Kean	Patterson	Walcott
Glenn	Keyes	Phipps	Watson
Goff	McNary	Reed	
Goldsborough	Metcalf	Shortridge	
NAYS—53			
Ashurst	Cutting	Kendrick	Simmons
Barkley	Dill	La Follette	Smith
Black	Fletcher	McGill	Smoot
Blaine	Frazier	McKellar	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	George	McMaster	Thomas, Okla.
Bratton	Glass	Morrison	Trammell
Brock	Harris	Norris	Wagner
Brookhart	Harrison	Nye	Walsh, Mass.
Broussard	Hatfield	Pine	Walsh, Mont.
Capper	Hawes	Pittman	Wheeler
Caraway	Hayden	Robinson, Ark.	Williamson
Connally	Heffin	Schall	
Copeland	Howell	Sheppard	
Couzens	Jones	Shipstead	
NOT VOTING—13			
Blease	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.	Swanson
Bulkley	King	Steck	Waterman
Carey	Norbeck	Stephens	
Davis	Ransdell		

So Mr. REED's amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is upon the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] as modified, which will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill insert the following:

There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$25,000,000, to be immediately available and to be expended by the American National Red Cross for the purpose of supplying food, medicine, medical aid, and other essentials to afford adequate human relief in the present national emergency, to persons otherwise unable to procure the same. Any portion of this appropriation unexpended on June 30, 1932, shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. HEFLIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BULKLEY (when his name was called). I withhold my vote on account of my pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY]. If I were free to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. STEPHENS (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] and therefore withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. SWANSON. On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN], who is unavoidably detained from the Senate. I understand that if he were present he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 56, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—56			
Ashurst	Borah	Broussard	Copeland
Barkley	Bratton	Capper	Couzens
Black	Brock	Caraway	Cutting
Blaine	Brookhart	Connally	Dill

Fletcher	Howell	Norris	Smith
Frazier	Jones	Nye	Thomas, Idaho
George	Kean	Pine	Thomas, Okla.
Glass	Kendrick	Pittman	Trammell
Harris	La Follette	Robinson, Ark.	Tydings
Harrison	McGill	Schall	Wagner
Hatfield	McKellar	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Hawes	McMaster	Shipstead	Walsh, Mont.
Hayden	McNary	Shortridge	Wheeler
Heflin	Morrison	Simmons	Williamson

NAYS—27

Bingham	Goldsborough	Morrow	Smoot
Dale	Gould	Moses	Steinwer
Deneen	Hale	Oddie	Townsend
Fess	Hastings	Partridge	Vandenberg
Gillett	Hebert	Patterson	Walcott
Glenn	Keyes	Phipps	Watson
Goff	Metcalf	Reed	

NOT VOTING—13

Blease	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.	Swanson
Bulkley	King	Steck	Waterman
Carey	Norbeck	Stephens	
Davis	Ransdell		

So the amendment of Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas, as modified, was agreed to.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senator from Oklahoma is entitled to the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of its business to-day the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. BROOKHART. There are several committee meetings going on, and it is very inconvenient to have the Senate meet at 11 o'clock in the morning. I want to attend some of the committee sessions and I want also to attend the session of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Should my request be agreed to, the Senator will have an hour to attend the committee meeting or an hour and a half if the committee meeting shall begin at 9.30.

Mr. BROOKHART. We had but a half hour this morning as the committee met at 10.30 and the Senate at 11 o'clock. I think I will object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa objects.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator has that right, of course.

Mr. McNARY subsequently said: I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its work this afternoon it take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RAISING RED CROSS FUNDS IN SEATTLE, WASH.

Mr. JONES and Mr. SMOOT addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I will yield, if I do not thereby lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has the right to yield for a question without losing the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield, then, to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I will not be able to be on the floor of the Senate while the bill is being further discussed to-day. I have here a telegram from M. A. Matthews, chairman of the Seattle Chapter of the Red Cross, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The telegram is as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., January 17, 1931.

HON. WESLEY L. JONES,
Washington, D. C.:

The Seattle Chapter, American Red Cross, passed a resolution memorializing Congress to pass a bill authorizing the Red Cross to spend \$10,000,000 for the sufferers or to pass a bill authorizing

some Government agent to spend that amount for the sufferers in the drought-cursed districts. Remember the resolution consisted of a memorial and did not have any criticism of the action of Congress on its pending bills but it does plead with Congress to help us handle the situation. We do not believe it will be possible to raise \$75,000 to \$100,000 in the City of Seattle at this time. What is your advice. Please give us help.

M. A. MATTHEWS, Chairman.

NEWSPAPER POLL ON PROHIBITION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several newspaper articles bearing on the poll conducted by the Newspaper Enterprise Association Press Service of the dailies of the country on the subject of prohibition.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSPAPER ENTERPRISE ASSOCIATION POLL OF DAILIES FULFILLS SHORT-LIVED PLAN OF DRY BUREAU—STRAW VOTE BROACHED BY WOODCOCK AND THEN CANCELED IS CARRIED OUT INDEPENDENTLY
By Bruce Catton

Eleven years after national prohibition became effective, a nation-wide poll of approximately 1,500 daily newspapers with circulations totaling many millions shows:

Three hundred and eighty-nine newspapers, with a total circulation of 3,932,041, favor the prohibition amendment as it now stands.

Three hundred and forty-five newspapers, with a total circulation of 12,520,911, are opposed to the prohibition amendment as it now stands.

Thirty-eight newspapers, with a circulation of 263,869, favor modification of the Volstead Act.

Eighty-seven newspapers, with a circulation of 616,404, are neutral on the subject of prohibition.

Six hundred and forty-nine newspapers or thereabouts apparently did not choose to express an opinion as they made no reply to questionnaires.

EIGHT HUNDRED AND FIFTY-NINE EDITORS REPLY

Replies were received from 859 newspapers, having a combined circulation of 17,333,225. Based on the standard newspaper estimate that there are four readers for each subscriber or newspaper buyer, these replies are those of papers that are read by 69,332,900 persons.

That sums up the result of a nation-wide poll of newspapers just conducted by Newspaper Enterprise Association Service (Inc.), the world's largest newspaper feature service, of which the Washington Daily News is a client.

SURVEY DROPPED BY WOODCOCK

It was a poll designed to do the work of the poll which the Prohibition Bureau started last fall and then suddenly canceled.

The Prohibition Bureau sent questionnaires to editors throughout the country. Before replies could be received, however, the survey was canceled by Col. Amos W. W. Woodcock, Federal prohibition director. He said he feared the purpose of the questionnaire might be misunderstood.

Solely as a matter of public information, and with no desire to prove anything either for or against prohibition, Newspaper Enterprise Association Service took up this survey which the bureau abandoned. Results of the poll are presented here to-day.

SAME QUESTIONS ASKED

The original letter sent out by the bureau asked these four questions:

1. Are you in favor of the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act?

2. Are you opposed to these enactments?

4. Will you state briefly your reasons for adopting the policy you are advocating?

The questionnaire sent out by Newspaper Enterprise Association Service contained those same four questions. Also it was pointed out that the editorial attitude of the newspapers was being sought and not the personal opinions of the editors.

1,500 DAILIES QUESTIONED

Questionnaires were mailed to 1,500 daily newspapers listed in the yearbook issued by Editor and Publisher. They were sent to all these, regardless of geographical location, political leanings, or previously expressed positions on prohibition.

The totals reveal that papers following an outright prohibition policy outnumbered the papers which advocate repeal of the dry laws, and make up approximately 45 per cent of the number reporting.

Papers which favor repeal constitute, roughly, 40 per cent of the total.

Papers which uphold the eighteenth amendment but want to see the Volstead Act modified to provide for light wines and beers number about 4½ per cent.

Papers which have adopted a neutral policy in regard to prohibition make up nearly 10½ per cent.

FORTY-FIVE PER CENT ARE DRY

Thus, to sum up, as indicated by this poll, 45 per cent of the country's dailies are editorially dry, 40 per cent are for repeal, 4½ per cent want modification, and 10½ per cent are expressing no opinion.

The theory that prohibition sentiment is stronger in rural districts and small cities than in the big metropolitan centers is borne out by the poll.

LARGER PAPERS WET

The picture changes when total circulations, rather than the number of newspapers, is considered.

The 389 newspapers which uphold prohibition have a total daily circulation of 3,932,041.

The 345 newspapers which demand complete repeal have a total daily circulation of 12,520,911.

The papers which want modification reach 263,869 subscribers or buyers daily, and the neutral papers have a total circulation of 616,404.

An accompanying table shows how the vote was divided.

How papers line up on dry law

State	For prohibition		For repeal		For modification		Neutral	
	Papers	Circulation	Papers	Circulation	Papers	Circulation	Papers	Circulation
Alabama	4	24,942	3	75,383	0	0	0	0
Arizona	1	31,307	5	13,898	0	0	1	2,872
Arkansas	7	59,748	5	22,560	0	0	5	15,859
California	24	115,543	24	616,819	1	1,645	9	19,728
Colorado	10	37,818	5	55,482	2	5,360	0	0
Connecticut	1	12,471	10	146,127	0	0	1	(1)
Delaware	0	0	1	13,726	0	0	0	0
Florida	8	33,986	11	143,620	2	7,589	1	3,657
Georgia	7	37,016	2	108,143	1	3,525	2	6,900
Idaho	3	10,949	3	9,116	0	0	3	17,565
Illinois	24	172,307	15	1,499,713	4	45,578	8	51,096
Indiana	18	253,728	25	296,953	2	14,837	7	47,418
Iowa	9	45,916	9	111,539	1	2,185	0	0
Kansas	22	182,959	2	5,615	0	0	2	7,359
Kentucky	3	10,055	3	36,330	0	0	2	10,834
Louisiana	4	37,253	4	99,578	0	0	0	0
Maine	1	6,528	1	20,607	0	0	0	0
Maryland	3	9,805	3	417,141	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	6	107,910	7	136,390	0	0	4	27,311
Michigan	13	124,384	10	445,038	3	26,718	5	132,943
Minnesota	8	143,839	7	99,198	0	0	1	2,275
Mississippi	3	33,282	2	8,680	0	0	0	0
Missouri	16	327,690	6	275,639	0	0	0	0
Montana	2	7,389	4	17,467	1	15,924	0	0
Nebraska	1	4,268	6	86,992	1	2,933	0	0
Nevada	0	0	6	18,088	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	1	6,642	2	9,288	1	4,179	0	0
New Mexico	3	6,884	1	14,949	0	0	2	2,752
New Jersey	3	45,743	13	458,315	1	24,224	2	21,979
New York	18	273,865	32	3,529,301	3	58,551	4	27,228
North Carolina	7	43,021	2	11,897	0	0	1	3,074
North Dakota	2	7,375	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ohio	23	143,139	23	1,539,178	1	2,640	5	19,006
Oklahoma	24	258,184	5	151,575	4	8,868	2	3,072
Oregon	5	120,009	8	71,701	2	5,659	0	0
Pennsylvania	35	616,652	20	931,698	3	14,226	6	94,385
Rhode Island	2	21,559	1	31,524	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	4	20,824	0	0	1	4,269	0	0
South Dakota	5	24,851	1	1,455	2	4,677	0	0
Tennessee	3	41,030	3	146,618	0	0	1	2,994
Texas	31	314,103	13	139,471	0	0	4	16,025
Utah	1	2,732	5	89,602	0	0	0	0
Vermont	2	23,610	3	12,863	0	0	0	0
Virginia	4	19,153	2	16,963	0	0	0	0
Washington	7	33,779	6	157,150	0	0	2	9,109
West Virginia	6	40,063	4	48,788	0	0	3	24,063
Wisconsin	4	29,908	20	321,709	2	10,282	3	12,765
Wyoming	1	7,822	1	(1)	0	0	0	0
District of Columbia	0	0	1	57,044	0	0	1	34,129
Total	389	3,932,041	345	12,520,911	38	263,869	87	616,404

¹ Circulation figures not available.

LARGER THE WETTER, IS CONCLUSION IN NEWSPAPER POLL—AVERAGE CIRCULATION OF DAILIES THAT OPPOSE PROHIBITION IS 36,291; DRY PAPERS, 10,108

By Bruce Catton

Analysis of the national survey by Newspaper Enterprise Association service of the prohibition views of American newspapers seem to indicate that a newspaper's wetness, generally speaking, is in direct proportion to its size.

Replies were received from 859 newspapers in all parts of the country. Of these, 389 declared for prohibition as it stands, 345 seek repeal of the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act, 38 favor modification of the Volstead Act, and 87 are neutral.

The average daily circulation of the papers which favor prohibition is 10,108.

The average circulation of those that oppose prohibition is 36,291.

Papers calling for modification average 6,944 in daily circulation and the neutral papers average 7,085.

The survey was conducted on the basis of a questionnaire circulated last fall by the Federal Prohibition Bureau. The bureau's plan was abandoned when Col. Amos W. W. Woodcock, prohibition director, decided its purpose might be misunderstood.

Newspaper Enterprise Association service thereupon mailed out its own questionnaires, containing the same questions as those asked in Colonel Woodcock's original survey, to approximately 1,500 American dailies.

FIGURES ANALYZED

The total circulation of the 859 papers that replied in the poll was 17,333,225. When these papers are classified according to their sizes, added interest is given the results. For example:

Replies were received from 35 papers whose circulations were more than 100,000 each. Of these 35 papers, 30 were for repeal and 5 were dry.

Replies were received from 47 papers whose circulations were between 40,000 and 100,000 each. Of these 47 papers, 36 were for repeal, 9 were dry, and 2 were neutral.

Replies were received from 97 papers between 15,000 and 40,000 in circulation. Of the 97, 49 were for repeal, 36 were dry, 6 were neutral, and 6 were for modification.

Replies were received from 234 papers, between 5,000 and 15,000 in circulation. Of the 234, 82 were for repeal, 120 were dry, 24 were neutral, and 8 were for modification.

Replies were received from 426 papers under 5,000 circulation. Of the 426, 141 were for repeal, 209 were dry, 54 were neutral, and 22 were for modification.

The survey, accordingly, seems to establish fairly definitely that large papers constitute the bulk of the wet strength, while the small-city paper is the backbone of the prohibition cause.

THE VOTE BY SECTIONS

An analysis of results by sections follows:

New England States: 13 dry newspapers, 24 wet, 1 for modification, and 1 neutral.

Middle Atlantic States: 60 dry, 69 wet, 7 for modification, and 13 neutral.

South Atlantic States: 30 dry, 17 wet, 4 for modification, and 4 neutral.

Gulf States: 42 dry, 22 wet, none for modification, and 4 neutral.

Middle Western States: 113 dry, 105 wet, 13 for modification, and 32 neutral.

Lower Mississippi Valley: 29 dry, 17 wet, none for modification, and 8 neutral.

Wheat Belt States: 54 dry, 14 wet, 7 for modification, and 4 neutral.

Rocky Mountain States: 21 dry, 23 wet, 3 for modification, and 6 neutral.

Pacific coast: 36 dry, 44 wet, 3 for modification, and 11 neutral.

INDIANA A SURPRISE

That the Middle West is debatable ground may be indicated by the fact that its numerous newspapers are almost evenly divided with the wets holding a slight edge in the number of papers and a heavy advantage in total circulation.

Kansas lives up to its dryness by having 22 dry papers and 2 wet ones. Indiana, traditionally dry, surprisingly shows 25 wet newspapers against 18 dry ones.

MANY BENEFITS SEEN BY EDITORS FAVORING PROHIBITION LAWS—PUBLISHERS SUPPORTING AMENDMENT CONVINCED IT HAS CONFERRED GREAT GOOD ON COUNTRY

By Bruce Catton

American newspaper editors who support the prohibition amendment do so, in the main, because they believe it has conferred a vast moral and economic good on the country as a whole.

Some of them are far from satisfied with present conditions but believe that the defects of the existing situation will disappear in time. Others believe that repeal or modification of the law would only make matters worse.

All of this develops from an examination of the comments made by editors of dry newspapers who took part in the nation-wide newspaper survey conducted by Newspaper Enterprise Association service, of which the Daily News is a client. This survey, conducted along the lines of the one which Federal Prohibition Director Woodcock announced and then abandoned a few months ago, showed 389 dry newspapers, 345 wet ones, 38 that favor modification, and 87 that are neutral.

EDITORS GIVE REASONS

At the end of the questionnaire sent out by Newspaper Enterprise Association service there was a space for the editors to outline their reasons for following the policies their papers have adopted. To-day some excerpts from replies made by editors of prohibition papers are presented.

Typical is the following from an Indiana editor:

"In our section, at least, we are a lot better off under prohibition than we were in the days of the saloon. We shudder to think what would happen should as many folks as formerly get drunk and think they are able to drive their cars."

A Michigan editor remarks:

"Poor families are benefited because of prohibitive prices. The liquor appetite must gradually disappear. Law-enforcement agencies will become so rotten that the public will be awakened to the need of action, out of which there should develop temperance, both in crime and liquor consumption."

A California editor says that his paper supports prohibition "because of the terrible evils of the liquor traffic which we have experienced in this country. Every form of regulation having been tried at some period of our history and failed, and prohibition, with all of the difficulties, has unquestionably reduced the evils to a minimum, and will continue so to reduce them until finally they approach the vanishing point."

An Illinois editor lists his points as follows:

"Better conditions in homes of workers; increase in home owning; ending of drunkenness as an industrial evil; increase in savings which has enabled many in present bad business period to live on savings which would otherwise have been spent for liquor. This is an industrial district and my statements are based on survey among employers, building associations, bankers, business men."

A similar note is sounded by this, from an Alabama editor:

"Present conditions are an advance over the licensed saloon. The old man isn't lit up so often and the kids get more shoes and more stockings."

FEWER HUNGRY CHILDREN

Similar is this, from a Michigan editor:

"Under the eighteenth amendment there are not nearly so many women washing and scrubbing, and not nearly so many children going hungry and barefooted as there were before its adoption."

That question, "What have the wets to offer?" is cited by a number of prohibition editors. One in Pennsylvania writes:

"Even though imperfectly enforced through official laxity and political pressure, the amendment finds this country, in our opinion, infinitely better than before. National prohibition had to come because high license laws, local option, and State prohibition failed to regulate the liquor traffic. No substitute for national prohibition has been proposed with anything like the general agreement back of it that national prohibition has. To abandon it in view of this fact would be perilous and not to be considered."

A surprisingly large number of editors simply wrote, in reply to the question, "Will you state briefly your reason for adopting the policy you are advocating?"—"Moral and economic."

[From the Washington Daily News, Monday, January 19, 1931]

DEFECTS IN PROHIBITION RÉGIME CITED BY EDITORS OF PAPERS WORKING FOR REPEAL

By Bruce Catton

A feeling that the prohibition amendment is proving fundamentally unworkable and a belief that it has fostered crime and corruption to such an extent as to outweigh its benefits are the reasons for repeal most frequently cited by editors of newspapers which oppose the dry law.

This develops from a scrutiny of replies received in the nationwide survey of newspaper attitudes toward prohibition conducted by Newspaper Enterprise Association service on the lines outlined by the Federal Prohibition Bureau, which announced such a survey last fall and then canceled it for fear that its purpose might be misunderstood.

DRYS HAVE MAJORITY

The Newspaper Enterprise Association survey showed that 389 American dailies uphold the dry law, while 345 favor repeal. In addition, 38 uphold the amendment but want the Volstead Act modified, while 87 have adopted a neutral position.

A fair sample of the statements made by antiprohibition editors is the following from the editor of a small-city paper in Indiana:

"We believe the prohibition law can never be enforced, and that since the law became operative there has been more crime than ever before in the same period. Besides, the law created bootleggers and grafters of all kinds, many of them getting immensely wealthy; and it now takes millions to keep down the traffic while the Government is losing millions in revenue, losing on both ends."

From Virginia comes the following:

"Our newspapers advocate some such solution of the prohibition question as the dispensary system because we believe that the present prohibition enactments have definitely been proved unworkable, and while they have resulted in some good, are doing the Nation preponderantly more harm than good."

POINTS TO CORRUPTION

An editor in a big city in the State of Washington said that he opposes prohibition:

"Because anyone who is not blind can see the corruption, graft, crime, and general disrespect for law even among those who are supposed to enforce it, that are resulting under the present law. Liquor is now being taken to the home and consumed by young as well as old, and the rotten stuff that is drunk does ten times more harm than would good liquor."

A New Jersey editor expresses himself thus:

"Enforcement has been a failure. Prohibition is mainly responsible for increase in crime and many of the new types of 'rackets' that have sprung up. With the dry laws has come the speak-easy, which is much worse than the old type of saloon."

Another New Jersey editor remarks heatedly:

"Prohibition is intemperate in principle, unwarranted in policy, unenforceable in practice, and unsuccessful in performance."

Some editors tell of a change of attitude since 1920. A Vermont editor writes as follows:

"Am a total abstainer and earnestly supported the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act, but they have proved a calamity worse than war. No liquor control law is a success, but what we have now is so awful that we should try again."

HE CHANGED HIS MIND

And a Pennsylvania editor says:

"Always an advocate of liquor reform and at first a supporter of prohibition, this newspaper opposes eighteenth amendment,

Volstead and Jones laws because of very apparent corruption of law agencies, openness of violations, and creation of a drinking smartness that is giving liquor a new and undreamed-of smartness. In every test which this newspaper has applied to prohibition the result has always been the same. It is impossible of enforcement and always will be."

From the editor of a big New York newspaper comes this:

"Federal prohibition is a constitutional anomaly. Its purpose is undesirable and it is unworkable in practice. The evils it has produced are greater than those which it was designed to remedy."

The traditional southern doctrine of State rights is cited by a South Carolina editor in the following:

"Prohibition should be a State affair. This is the old and correct attitude of the South. The South went back on its own doctrine in the vote on the eighteenth amendment—and the nineteenth also. If a majority of voters in South Carolina, my State, vote for prohibition I would cheerfully acquiesce. In fact, I always supported prohibition in South Carolina before 1920."

CALLS IT "HUGE JOKE"

A Texas editor expresses himself with typical Texas candor in this:

"It is a huge joke; bootleggers are as thick as hairs on a dog's back; doctors writing prescriptions at \$3; druggists selling cheap booze at \$3.50 per pint, making a gallon of 80-cent whisky sell at \$52. Believe Government should take over the booze business and put it in dispensaries, selling same so cheap it would put bootleggers out of business. It is the chief commodity of gangland; millions of dollars squandered in trying to enforce law. The prohibition leaders appear to be backing the dry law in order to hold fat jobs."

Pleas for State control and sale of liquor are voiced by many editors. Typical is the following from Nebraska:

"We are advocating an amendment to the eighteenth amendment, if necessary, to the end that the Government may contract for the manufacture and itself distribute to the consumer, in limited quantities, much after the Swedish system, such liquors demanded, for the reasons that the present premium on crime will be removed, the cause of real temperance advanced, and governmental costs reduced."

WANTS GOVERNMENT SALE

A Wisconsin editor agrees:

"Favor modification for its probable effect in lessening rackets resultant from these measures; believe manufacture and distribution of commodity of volume reached in illicit liquor consumption should be under Government supervision."

Complaints that prohibition has been harmful to youth are occasionally voiced; as in this, from a Minnesota editor:

"A fair trial of the dry laws has proved a flat failure, leaving a trail of debauched youths, corrupt public servants, countless 'moon' joints, speakeasies, and vicious night clubs, an increasing crime wave, and powerful gang and racket rings."

A Florida editor cites these reasons for opposing the dry laws:

"Universal use of intoxicants by American youths of both sexes. Diversion of capital in millions of dollars into the hands of rum-heads. Ineffective enforcement. Through rum activities, capital falling into hands of persons of bolshevistic ideas and a threat to safety of Nation. One of leading causes of financial condition of country at present."

CITES CAUSES OF GRAFT

A Massachusetts editor complains of prohibition:

"It has brought about widespread corruption in police departments and practically every law-enforcement organization. It has likewise developed more corruption in municipal government than we have experienced for many years."

A disillusioned and perplexed Vermont editor writes that his paper is neither for nor against prohibition, adding:

"Am advocating no policy. The old system of saloons under local option was a misfortune. The present system under prohibition is a calamity. Am in favor of trying something else, hoping for improvement."

INAUGURAL ADDRESS AND MESSAGE OF GOVERNOR OF OHIO

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. George White on the occasion of his recent inauguration as Governor of Ohio, and also his message to the General Assembly of Ohio. I ask that the address and message may be printed in 7½-point type.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BULKLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I just submitted a request for unanimous consent that the inaugural address of Governor White, of Ohio, and his message to the general assembly be printed in 7½-point type. The Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] calls my attention to the fact that the rule universally adhered to in such matters is that articles and addresses published in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type. I do not wish to press that request against his suggestion, and therefore withdraw that part of my request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the address and the message will be printed in the RECORD in the regular form.

The address and message are as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY GOV. GEORGE WHITE, OF OHIO, AT HIS INAUGURATION IN COLUMBUS, ON JANUARY 12, 1931

My fellow citizens, again we come to that crossroad in government established by the forefathers.

To-day we induct into office those chosen by the people to direct the various and manifold affairs of our State government for the ensuing biennium.

We pride ourselves upon being a self-governed democracy, but the full benefits of such a system of government can be attained only to the extent to which there is active participation by all citizens. We have lamentably failed in our duties in that respect. It may be proper, therefore, to attribute such defects as exist in our governmental processes largely to that spirit of indifference upon the part of so large a body of our citizens.

Happily, due to the liberal home-rule provisions of our Constitution, wisely enacted in years gone by, many of our municipalities have made great strides forward in the matter of local self-government actively participated in by practically the entire body politic.

Let us hope that more of our political subdivisions of government may take advantage of these liberal provisions of our basic law and become more efficient self-governing entities, with an enhanced sense of responsibility upon the part of their voters to make such local self-government efficient and effective.

Warnings were voiced in the days of the fathers of the dangers of centralization of government.

Those warnings can not be repeated too often to-day, when we see on every hand the vast centralization of power in the Federal Government and the tendency upon the part of the State government to take over in paternalistic fashion more and more of the functions and duties rightfully belonging to local communities and individual citizens.

Both as a Nation and as a State, we are cursed with a multiplicity of laws.

I believe that the time has long since arrived when there should be a cessation in our legislative overproduction and our energies should be devoted more zealously to a solution of constructive problems of government.

True it may be, that ours is a government of laws and not of men, but it is my belief that in this day, government is top-heavy, both with laws and men.

I agree with the principle enunciated by that great president who bluntly stated that public office is a public trust. It was my great privilege to receive instruction and counsel at the feet of one who later, as president of the United States, gave his life for the sacred cause of world democracy.

If we, who are entrusted with power at the hands of the people, will but guide our actions by giving heed to example and precept established by those eminent in State and Nation who have gone before—yes, even to the extent of profiting by the very human mistakes made by them—we can not go far wrong.

The immediate problems of government in Ohio are of tremendous importance to the people of the State. Their proper solution will require cooperation to the utmost between all of the chosen representatives of the people, without regard to politics or petty personal interest.

I pledge for myself personally, and I firmly believe, for those appointed to office by me, conscientious endeavor to solve these problems solely in the interest of all the people and in such manner that the greatest good will ensue to the greatest number.

By mandate of the people, those in public authority are charged with the duty of completely remodeling the taxation system of our State. This is a task colossal in its magnitude, but one which must not be shirked.

My pledge has been given that in any new system of taxation the burdens of those who for so long a time have paid more than their just share, namely, the farmer and home owner, shall not be increased.

I have further pledged that no new imposts shall be levied upon our wage and salary earners until the effort is honestly made to bring out from hiding those billions in intangible property heretofore escaping scot-free and requiring their owners to pay their just and reasonable share of taxes.

Having in mind that in a true democracy we must ever concede the supreme right of the people themselves to rule, I shall recommend that taxation legislation be submitted to the people for the exercise of their solemn right of referendum, unless such legislation as may be enacted affords reasonable satisfaction to all concerned.

There must be no encroachment upon this vested, inherent right of the people to a direct voice in government through the use of the initiative and referendum.

Rather than attempt to curtail its use, or further burden its invocation by more stringent and burdensome technical requirements, the way should be made easier for our people to solve for themselves many of the governmental problems which grow apace as the complexities of modern civilization become more and more entangled with government, both in state and nation.

Gaunt, stark tragedy has caused us almost to hang our heads in shame, and has brought vividly home to us our woeful record of neglect over a period of years in dealing with our State charitable,

correctional, and penal institutions having in charge those who may only rightfully be designated as wards of the State.

The burden of righting this wrong rests upon the conscience of every man and woman in Ohio. There is no escaping the inexorable demands of that conscience.

The problem must be faced and a right solution found immediately. The lessons of the tragic holocaust of last year brook no excuse or delay.

We owe to these wards of the State every possible precaution to insure the safety and well being of their physical bodies; we owe to them, wherever possible to give it, the beneficent influences of education; we owe to them the exertion of every effort toward the healing of mental and moral ills, to the end that an ever-increasing number may again become useful members of society.

The task is a large one, made all the more so by our years of seeming indifference and neglect.

The solution of the problem by means of temporary makeshifts to tide over the crisis during the period of our own immediate generation will not do.

We owe it to posterity that such measures as we take shall have in mind the needs of future generations, hence the remedies which we apply must be of reasonable permanence in their nature and must give consideration to the generations to follow us, in so far as it may be possible to foresee those needs.

And as a matter of right and justice it may be proper that some of the burden incident thereto should be borne by the generations yet to come. We stand pledged to economy in the expenditures for administrative cost of the State government.

Such curtailment of expenditure of public funds becomes all the more imperative in view of the warning just given by the chief fiscal officer of the State of reduced revenues which may be anticipated for the State treasury during the next two years.

In this as in many other matters I shall ask for and expect to receive legislative cooperation.

For me the solemn oath of office, just taken in the name of Almighty God, has a scope and meaning much broader than would be conveyed by a mere literal interpretation of the words and phrases thereof.

The specific duties imposed by the constitution and laws upon the governor, both affirmative and negative, must be carried out; as the one in whom the supreme executive power of the State is vested it is the duty of the governor also to see to it that others vested with executive authority carry out the specific mandates of the constitution and laws.

But aside from the mere carrying out of direct mandates of the constitution I believe that there is a higher duty devolving upon one who solemnly swears to support and defend it.

I feel that it becomes my sacred duty as governor to see to it, in so far as it may be humanly possible, that every right, privilege, and guaranty accorded you, the people of Ohio, under this constitution shall be zealously guarded and preserved for you and for posterity; that the guaranties of the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness shall be kept inviolate; the right to trial by jury kept free from encroachment; the inhibitions against unlawful searches and seizures preserved, and every other right accorded in our basic law be upheld and maintained for the people.

Where there have been in the past encroachments upon any of these rights through the well meaning but mistaken efforts of overzealous individuals or groups, such errors should be corrected and full and complete constitutional government restored in every respect to the people of our State.

The year in retrospect has been a most trying one for us as a people. There appears to be a feeling of universal relief at its passing, with hope for better things in the years immediately ahead.

With the effects of devastating drought still uneradicated, with economic conditions still in a sad state of maladjustment, with the suffering due to nation-wide unemployment a grim reality in countless thousands of homes, with every agency striving to the utmost to relieve actual hunger and privation, we find ourselves fighting with our backs to the wall.

Some would have it that these seeming misfortunes have come upon us because we as a people in our meteoric advancement in material good fortune were fast losing sight of basic economic and moral principles, and that the reaction was a necessary thing for its sobering influence, and to force us to halt and take stock of fundamental matters.

Whatever the cause, and whatever the justification or blame for conditions which exist, the active aid and assistance of all will be required in their righting. As your governor, I pledge that I shall, to the extent of my ability, do my part. I ask that you, as citizens, do yours.

In the accomplishment of all of these tasks there must be no looking backward, nor may we supinely stand still, marking time.

It is only by aggressive, forward-looking action that results may be achieved.

It is my hope that the general assembly now in session, and the executive and judicial branches of the State government may join hands in ridding Ohio of her governmental ills and in making government in Ohio a vital, responsive thing, functioning in the interest of all the people.

With unselfish, united effort, and with the inspiration and guidance of that Divine Being who watches over all, let us, with heads erect and eyes front, go forward toward the sunrise to meet the dawning of a brighter and better day.

MESSAGE OF GEORGE WHITE, GOVERNOR OF OHIO, JANUARY 13, 1931
To the Eighty-ninth General Assembly:

Not since Ohio was admitted into the Union has any general assembly faced problems of greater magnitude than the one of which you are members. Likewise no Governor of Ohio has been confronted with questions more perplexing or tasks more vitally serious than those of the present. It falls to our lot, therefore, yours and mine, to perform our solemn duties not in a mere perfunctory manner but diligently and aggressively, without regard to the amount of labor involved, and particularly without regard to the circumstance that your body has a majority of one political faith while the governor is of opposite party affiliation. There must be neither vainglory nor seeking for personal or party advantage. The task before us requires on our part an eye single to the comfort, safety, and well-being of the people of Ohio.

Our State, as the entire Nation, is suffering from a heart-rending economic depression and, in sections, from the effects of a devastating drought. In times of crisis, like this, it behooves all branches of the government, all public officials everywhere, to labor and cooperate harmoniously and earnestly for the common public weal. The general assembly is given by the Constitution the greater responsibility. Its function is that of lawmaking, in which the governor has only a negative authority by virtue of the veto power. However, it is within the province of the governor to make legislative suggestions and recommendations, and that is the purpose of this message. If we will look upon our problems as of mutual concern and obligation, if the general assembly and the governor jointly will devote their fullest energies and talents to the problems immediately confronting us, as God and conscience give us the light, we need not fear the prospects nor the ultimate outcome.

UNEMPLOYMENT

While we are all hoping for an early improvement in conditions, nevertheless the industrial situation in Ohio is at present, perhaps, at a lower ebb, on the average, than at any time in the past 50 years. The output of our farms, mines, and factories is, no doubt, greater than in any previous deep depression, but the percentage of actual production to the possible full capacity is probably lower than that of any previous similar period. The actual number of unemployed, therefore, in proportion to the total number of workers, industrial and otherwise, is larger than has ever been known.

It is not my purpose at this time to discuss the causes of this deplorable condition, which is inherited by the new administration. In common with all other States of the Union, Ohio is affected, in a degree, by world-wide economic conditions. It is my belief, also, that the economic principles adhered to by the leaders of the Republican Party for many years, through the operation of extortionate tariffs and special privileges extended to large groups of rich or monopolistic combinations of capital, have had the inevitable result of wealth in America becoming too unevenly and unfairly distributed. These policies, however, are Federal and can not be altered immediately, or even in the near future.

The present condition in Ohio is an emergency and must be promptly met as such. Many scores of thousands of our citizens, earnest, honest, industrious men and women, are now in the depth of winter unemployed. All of them, and their helpless dependents, are entitled on the score of social justice to food, warmth, shelter, and the other necessities of life.

Ohio is a rich State. It has a generous, warm-hearted people, capable and willing to care for all who are in need.

Some communities are wealthier and in better position than others to care for their unfortunates. Such relief is, first of all, a local problem and duty, and I am happy to say it is being recognized as such. There are, however, some communities that have neither wealth nor resource, whose inhabitants are not able to help each other because no one has the means, and in such instances relief can come only from outside charitable organizations or the Public Treasury.

I recommend, therefore, that the general assembly, without delay, appropriate a reasonable sum to be used wherever distress is most acute—the expenditure to be surrounded by proper safeguards. Such an appropriation should be limited to the year 1931 and be confined to the sole purpose of emergency relief. Future contingencies may be met later if necessary.

TAXATION

Since time immemorial the foremost perpetual problem of all governments has been that of taxation. It has been thus in the United States from the beginning. It has been so in Ohio throughout its history. Without taxes the government can not exist. Without government there can not be peace and order. It devolves upon the general assembly at its present session to solve the most unusual, the most perplexing, and most difficult taxation problem the State has ever known.

The responsibility for this task is delegated in article 12, section 4, of the constitution, as follows:

"The general assembly shall provide for raising revenue, sufficient to defray the expenses of the State, for each year."

As you are well aware, your predecessors, the eighty-eighth general assembly, submitted to the electors of Ohio in November, 1929, the question of amending the constitution so as to authorize the classification of property for taxation. The proposal was adopted by a vote of 710,000 to 510,000, and became effective January 1 last. I need not recite the detailed provisions of the amendment except to say that it provides that land and improvements thereon shall be taxed by uniform rule, according to value,

and that this class of property shall not be taxed in excess of a rate of 1½ per cent for all State and local purposes unless so voted by a majority of the electors of any given taxing district voting on the proposition.

For 80 years the Constitution of Ohio has provided for the taxing of all classes of property by uniform rule according to its true value in money. An entirely new system of taxation must now be devised. It is of the utmost importance that the new system be logical, reasonable, fair, and just. The object of the amendment, so its proponents assured the electors of Ohio, is to relieve real estate of the undue burden of taxation which it has borne under the uniform rule. The relief to real estate, so the people were assured, is to be afforded by means of placing on the tax duplicate the billions of dollars worth of intangible wealth which up to this time has almost completely escaped taxation.

It is the unmistakable duty of the general assembly now to keep faith with the citizenry of the State. Classification of property and the taxing of the various classes at rates which will place intangibles on the duplicate in amounts sufficient to reduce taxes on real estate have been promised. Having by their votes sustained this view, the people now expect this pledge to be kept. As governor I shall do everything in my power to bring about that result. I am opposed to the substitution of income or sales taxes or any other subterfuge to keep the brunt of the tax burden on the backs of the farm and home owners, the wage and average salary earners, until an earnest and honest effort has been made to secure the necessary revenues from other sources. The burden belongs where the ability to pay exists. The wealthy, the large corporations, especially the public-utility corporations, which enjoy incomes virtually guaranteed through the public-utilities commission and the courts; the banks, building and loan associations, mortgage corporations, and reservoirs of invested capital everywhere has this ability to pay. The Government of the United States has made it possible for great accumulations of capital and wealth to be amassed—some justly so, some by the granting of tariff favors and other special privileges. The government of the State of Ohio has too often been in accord with the national policy. The time has come now when wealth and capital in all their forms dare not be permitted longer to escape their full share of taxation. Not merely does the adoption of the classification amendment and the constitutional rate limitation on real estate make necessary the taxing of wealth and capital but the current economic depression makes it our only recourse. The value of farms and homes and the average income of the great body of taxpayers have diminished and in many instances the taxpaying ability has vanished entirely.

Government must continue. Government can survive only on taxes. The taxes must be procured from sources able to pay them. In view of the new rate limitation on real estate there remains only one available source from which these necessary revenues may be maintained, namely, capital.

The wealth of Ohio is reputed to approximate \$30,000,000,000. The existing tax duplicate—that is, the property returned for taxation—amounts to only \$13,600,000,000. This sum is composed of \$13,000,000,000 in real estate and tangible personal property and only \$600,000,000 of intangible personal property. By intangibles, of course, I mean money, stocks, bonds, and certificates of ownership of various kinds which are easily secreted from the view of the tax assessors.

The taxes collected on this duplicate in 1929, the latest year for which accurate figures are available, amounted to \$303,000,000 for State and all local purposes. This sum does not include the excise and franchise taxes and other indirect taxes levied by the State, largely for State purposes. A shrinkage in the tax value of real estate is imminent if real estate is to be reappraised this year, as directed by law. Some authorities estimate this shrinkage at possibly 20 per cent, which would reduce the tangible property duplicate by \$2,600,000,000, and reduce the taxes available to local taxing districts, municipalities, school districts, counties, and townships by nearly \$60,000,000 through this cause alone.

We have, therefore, three immediate and imperative reasons for tax reform in Ohio: First, the mandate of the classification amendment; second, the reduced tax-paying ability occasioned by the economic depression and unemployment; and, third, the anticipated decrease in the real-estate duplicate.

Whence can these losses in revenue be raised except from the stores of intangible wealth which have escaped taxation almost in their entirety for more than a generation? The new taxes must come from these hitherto neglected sources, although, in fairness, be it admitted that there has been a shrinkage also in the value of much intangible property in the past year.

Viewing the problem from all angles, I question seriously whether all the prospective reductions in revenue in State, school district, municipality, county, and township can be fully met with new taxes at one session of the general assembly without running the risk of affecting adversely the general tax-raising structure of Ohio. It is inevitable, to my mind, that the State and all its political subdivisions face an era of unprecedented enforced public economy.

This may in fact prove to be a salutary situation, provided the tax losses are not so drastic as to cripple the protection of society or retard the orderly progress of communities. There are some subdivisions which, I am convinced, have had more than ample public funds in the past; in fact, to a degree of prompting reckless and unnecessary spending. The officials of such districts will have difficulty in readjusting themselves to the lean conditions ahead, but they must learn. This is no time for extravagance in public spending. It is a time for the exercise of public econ-

omy in the same manner and for the same reasons most taxpayers are obliged to exercise private economy in their homes.

So far as the State government is concerned—that is to say, the departments under my control—I assert frankly that it is my purpose to reduce the cost of administration to a minimum consistent with good public policy. The most essential activities will be carried on first, less essential (though worthy) functions thereafter to the extent of funds available, and nonessentials not in any event.

The problem of taxation, the present task of adopting a new system of taxation for Ohio, can hardly be expected to be solved entirely at one session of the general assembly, but we can make a good beginning and must do so. Corrections and improvements will suggest themselves as time goes on. We must guard against the establishment of wrong principles which might live to plague us and our successors. Whatever is done must be safe and sound; it must be in the right direction.

GENERAL

It has been my purpose to confine myself in this message to the two immediate pressing subjects of unemployment and taxation. I have discussed largely taxation in general as the problem affects municipalities, counties, townships, and school districts, all of which face the most serious straits.

I am not unmindful of the depleted condition of the State treasury and shall address you more specifically on this subject as soon as I may ascertain through my director of finance the exact facts. Briefly, I might recite that the cash balance in all funds on December 31, 1928, was \$18,000,000; on December 31, 1929, \$23,600,000; and on December 31 last, only \$9,191,218.

The \$9,000,000 now in the treasury must not be accepted, however, as an actual balance. It merely represents cash in the treasury, against which there are encumbrances for contracts, roads, buildings, and other obligations in excess of this amount. It should be noted, therefore, that an actual deficit and not a balance exists in the State treasury. The precise amount of this deficit I have as yet been unable to ascertain.

In a few days, also, I shall address you on various other legislative problems, notably that of the department of public welfare and the penal, correctional, and benevolent institutions of the State.

It is the duty of the general assembly to devote itself first of all to the problem of taxation, because nearly all other contemplated legislation is contingent upon it. Legislation in general should be held to the minimum and be confined to measures of remedial character and to the repealing of useless existing laws.

STATEMENTS BY ROBERT E. LEE ON THE USE OF SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two brief statements by Gen. Robert E. Lee, whose birthday is being celebrated to-day, on the use of spirituous liquors. The statements are taken from page 25 of the publication, Gen. Robert E. Lee after Appomattox, edited by Franklin L. Riley, New York, and published by the Macmillan Co. in 1922.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To an organization among the students called "Friends of Temperance," General Lee wrote: "My experience through life has convinced me that, while moderation and temperance in all things are commendable and beneficial, abstinence from spirituous liquor is the best safeguard of morals and health." And from Arlington, on May 30, 1858, he wrote to his son: "I think it better to avoid it [spirituous liquor] altogether, as its temperate use is so difficult."

INVESTIGATION OF SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Oklahoma will yield to me for the purpose of permitting me to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 406, which I submitted and which went over under the rule. It proposes to amend the Senate resolution providing for the appointment of a committee to investigate campaign expenditures.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I will gladly yield if I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator will not lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If any Senator should object, the Senator would lose the floor. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 406.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 406) submitted by Mr. NORRIS on January 17, 1931, as follows:

Resolved, That the special committee of the Senate to investigate campaign expenditures, created under authority of Senate Resolution 215, adopted April 10, 1930, is hereby further authorized and empowered, in the furtherance of the duties provided for in

said Resolution 215, to take possession of ballots and ballot boxes and to impound the same for examination and consideration by said committee.

Mr. DILL. I inquire what is the request?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska has asked unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which has just been read.

Mr. DILL. I wish the Senator would not press that request at this time.

Mr. NORRIS. I will say to the Senator that the resolution would come up in regular order if the Senate would adjourn at some time, but if we are going to have recesses from day to day the resolution can not come up in regular order. If we could have an understanding that there would be an adjournment to-morrow night, I would withdraw the request.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in view of the agreement to take a recess, it will be impossible to have an adjournment to-night.

Mr. NORRIS. I said if we can have an adjournment to-morrow night.

Mr. McNARY. Inasmuch as there has not been a morning hour for a couple of weeks, I will be glad to move that the Senate adjourn when the time comes to-morrow evening.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well; then I withdraw my request.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14675) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the pending amendment is one that involves only the sum of \$51,000. It is not the amount of money that I am objecting to; it is the principle involved.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to ask the Senator a question. He said that the pending amendment involved only \$51,000. I should like to ask the Senator whether that will be a continuing sum in the future? Will it set a precedent that hereafter that sum will be taken out of the Treasury rather than out of the funds of the Indians?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. At the present time these three tribes of Indians have \$237,000 in their trust funds. Two thousand of these Indians out of a total of 4,000 have no property save the trust funds. They have no lands, no money. That leaves them a per capita wealth of \$58. This amendment proposes to take 25 per cent of the total wealth of each of these Indians to maintain a general agency and a general hospital serving other Indians who are not taxed to maintain the agency and the hospital. I propose, if I can have my amendment supported, not to take the money from the Indians' trust funds, but to take it from the General Treasury; and the amendment only goes to the one single year.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I do.

Mr. BRATTON. Has this thing been done in prior years?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. These Indians have never had an accounting made to them. They did not know, until their funds had been depleted to the extent of practically \$1,000,000, that these funds are being taken from their private trust funds. When their trust funds were almost gone they became inquisitive, and discovered that the Government had taken their money to maintain a hospital and an agency, and from their funds had been withdrawn almost a million dollars, over their protest, and without their consent, and even without their knowledge.

Mr. BRATTON. For how many years has this thing been going along?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. For at least 15 years. Protests have been made since this was discovered, and three years ago the Senate agreed to my amendment; but the

conference committee refused to accept the Senate amendment, and the sums were still taken from the trust funds. Last year I went before the committee with another protest. The committee did not heed my request. I gave notice that I should offer the amendment upon the floor. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], advised me that if I would not offer the amendment he would see if he could not work out some solution for the next year. Relying upon that, which I termed an implied promise—not a definite one—I did not offer the amendment last year. This year, when I went before the committee and made my protest, it was not heeded, and the item was returned by the committee in the bill that is here.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I assure the Senator that I am asking this question just for information, and not because I am opposed to his amendment. I probably shall vote for his amendment if I am given the opportunity to vote for it, because I think the Indians are really wards of this Nation in truth and in fact, and they ought to have the benefit of every doubt. As I understand the amendment, however, it will mean that hereafter, as well as this particular year, the amount appropriated for hospitalization will be taken from the General Treasury, and not from the Indian funds.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Either that, or the agency and the hospital must be closed, because these Indians do not have the funds with which to maintain either of them; and after these remnants of their trust funds have been expended the Government or some agency must provide the money to maintain the agency and the hospital or each of them must, forsooth, be closed.

At this time I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question, and I direct it to either of the chairmen—the chairman of the main committee or the chairman of the subcommittee.

If it is a fact that practically one-half of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians have no allotments; if it is a fact that many of these 2,000 landless Indians are insane, feeble-minded, blind, and crippled; if it is a fact that such Indians have no money or other property save their per capita interest in the remnants of trust funds; if it is a fact that the total of their trust funds unallocated is approximately only \$237,000, or approximately \$58 per Indian; and if it is a fact that their total income from all sources is less than \$20 per annum per Indian, would the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee still insist that 25 per cent of their total wealth be taken as provided in this bill, over their protest, to maintain a general agency and a general hospital?

I submit the interrogatory first to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say that as long as they have the money the appropriation ought to be taken from it. As soon as that money is expended, the appropriation will be made just the same, and it will be paid out of the Treasury of the United States. That is the policy that has been carried on here for years in relation to these Indians. The House saw no reason to change it.

I think there is \$237,000 or \$273,000 that they own in that fund to-day. Just as soon as that fund is exhausted, there is not any doubt in the world that the money will be paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

That is the answer, Mr. President.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I will direct another inquiry to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

How much tax must a citizen with total assets in trust funds in the sum of \$58 pay, first, to the Federal Government?

Mr. SMOOT. If they have no funds whatever, as the Senator states, they will never pay any tax.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. They have no lands—

Mr. SMOOT. Then they do not pay any tax.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. And they have only \$58 in a trust fund. I ask the distinguished chairman, first, how much money they are compelled to pay as a Federal tax?

Mr. SMOOT. None whatever.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Second, under the same conditions, how much do they pay any State as a tax?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Oklahoma knows more about the State tax than I do. These Indians are in his State.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No State would charge a citizen with only \$58 of trust funds any tax whatever.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think they would; but I could not answer the question. The Senator knows about that better than I do.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No city, no county, no township would charge a citizen with only \$58 of trust funds any sort of a tax.

The next question is, How much tax must a citizen pay on a total annual income of \$20—gross annual income, not net?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know that he would pay any, Mr. President, anywhere in the United States. Neither would the Indians pay any.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Then I will ask this question: If the Federal Government charges these Indians no tax—

Mr. SMOOT. It does not charge the Indians a tax at all.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. And if no State, no county, no city, no township charges them a tax, why should Congress, the guardian, charge these Indians, its wards, a tax of 25 per cent of their total worldly goods—not of their total income, but their total worldly goods—for the purpose of maintaining a general agency and a general hospital?

Mr. SMOOT. Neither the Government nor any one else imposes a tax of that kind. This is a trust fund. How wealthy are some of the Indians in this tribe?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. There is no Indian in the Kiowa, Comanche, or Apache Tribes who has any particular wealth. There might be a few of them who have allotments on which oil has been discovered, but very few. I am not appealing for them. I am appealing for 2,000 of them who have no lands and who have no money.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator want this \$273,000 trust fund divided among the Indians of that tribe?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Why, most certainly; and then it will give them only \$58 apiece.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, why does not the Senator introduce a bill to that effect? Then, if they had no trust fund here, the Senator knows that we would make the appropriation, the same as we have to other Indians.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I now submit the same inquiry to the chairman of the committee. I should like to have his reaction.

In the case of Indians who have only \$58 between themselves and starvation—no lands, no money, only their per capita interest in a trust fund, and that amounts to only \$58—is the distinguished chairman willing to have Congress take 25 per cent of that amount now to maintain a general agency and a general hospital that serves other Indians? That is what this amendment proposes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] has given a very good answer to the question of the Senator from Oklahoma. I think we should not overlook this fact; or, rather, I desire to emphasize it: If these Indians need appropriations to take care of them—to take care of them in sickness, to take care of them in hunger, to take care of them in cold—we will make them. I can see no special reason why their funds should lie idle, so far as that is concerned. As I say, we will take care of these wards of the Government. They will be taken care of adequately, too.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the two distinguished chairmen have made two remarkable admissions—admissions never before made, I think, anywhere in the world—that they are proposing to tax feeble-minded, insane, blind, and crippled people 25 per cent of their total

resources in the world, which are only \$58, to help maintain an agency that supervises at least 10 or 11 other Indian reservations, and to maintain a hospital that takes care of all the other Indians who go there and apply for assistance.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. Whatever money they get or are authorized to get in this bill is to take care of just the people of whom the Senator speaks. They never could pay a dollar, and they are cared for. So are the school children cared for by this appropriation.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I now read from a telegram of date December 30. I wired to a member of the Indian tribe who used to be an employee of the Indian Service. I wanted to get accurate information as to the number of these particular Indians who have no lands, who have no allotments; and I submit the following statement from this telegram:

Replying to message, advise that approximately 2,100 of the three tribes unallotted.

That means that of the total number of 4,000, 2,100—more than 50 per cent—of these Indians have no lands.

On yesterday I sent a telegram to the same former clerk of the Anadarko agency. I asked this clerk to go to the agency and ascertain from the records whether or not some of the Indians for whom I am now pleading are insane, feeble-minded, blind, or crippled; and I have this reply of this date:

Your wire 18th requesting information. Insane, 1; feeble-minded, 20; blind, 33; crippled, 16; total of 70.

Of the 2,100 Indians proposed to be taxed by this amendment, 70 are insane, feeble-minded, blind, or crippled.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. I should like to know if the Senator has any information as to why that number of those Indians happen to be blind?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Largely as the result of a disease called trachoma, for which no proper medical treatment has been provided by the guardian, the Government of the United States.

Mr. FRAZIER. What made me ask the question is that the Senator from Utah has just stated that these Indians, these wards of the Government, are being well taken care of. If they had been well taken care of, in my estimation, no such number in one tribe would be blind as a result of disease which has not been taken care of by the people who are looking after these Indians.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator is wrong. I did not say "well."

Mr. FRAZIER. I accept that correction.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I quote further from the telegram:

Total of 70, which is an approximate number known by me and also by agency officials here. If necessary to send names will send them by mail.

JASPER SAUNKEAH.

I shall again refer to testimony which we may take as authentic.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BRATTON. Did I understand the Senator to say a while ago that this hospital serves other tribes?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes; I will explain that now.

Mr. BRATTON. And that the entire cost is borne out of trust funds of the three tribes?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Not the entire cost, but a considerable part of the cost is borne by the trust funds of three tribes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I will take care of the matter. Answering the Senator from New Mexico, I read from a telegram of this date sent me by the superintendent of the hospital, Dr. H. W. Langheim. The telegram is as follows:

Total patients in hospital.....	78
Patients other than Comanches, Kiowas, and Apaches.....	22
Total unallotted Comanches, Kiowas, and Apaches.....	83

There are 14 tribes, also eligible whites and Mexicans, in the above total.

Not only is this a hospital which serves the Comanches, Kiowas, and Apaches, who are taxed to support it, but there are there the representatives of 14 other tribes, and in addition to having 14 other tribes represented there, they have eligible whites and Mexicans in the hospital.

This great committee proposes to tax feeble-minded Indians, insane Indians, blind Indians, and crippled Indians, to maintain a hospital for 14 other tribes and for whites and Mexicans.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, will the Senator permit another question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Certainly.

Mr. BRATTON. What proportion of the expenses of maintaining the hospital is taken from the tribal funds of these particular tribes?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I have here, and I submit to the Senate, a letter from the superintendent of the agency, Mr. Buntin, of date April 23, 1930. He sets forth in this the different funds from which the supplies come, and I will read it for the information of the Senator:

Funds used for agency expenses

Proceeds oil and gas, S½, Red River, Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Indians, Oklahoma, support, 1930.....	\$32,495
Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche 4 per cent fund, support, 1930.....	3,600
Interest on Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche 4 per cent fund, support, 1930.....	2,000
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Kiowa Indians, support, 1930.....	\$3,000
Conservation of health among Indians, 1930.....	11,227
Support of Indians and administration of Indian property, 1930.....	11,160
Pay of Indian police.....	1,560
Industrial work and care of timber (A. & S.), 1930.....	11,757
40793.1 Indian agency buildings, 1930.....	4,629
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Kiowa Agency.....	3,850
	<hr/>
	47,183 38,095

Funds for hospital expenses

Proceeds oil and gas, S½, Red River, Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians, Oklahoma, support, 1930.....	18,905
Conservation of health among Indians, 1930.....	\$12,930
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, Kiowa Agency.....	500
	<hr/>
	13,430

Total.....	57,000
------------	--------

That sum is taken from the trust fund of these three tribes to maintain this general hospital, which serves representatives of 15 tribes, and even white people and Mexicans.

Mr. President, on the same date the superintendent of the hospital sent me the following information:

List of the different tribes of Indians entered as patients at the Kiowa Hospital beginning July 1, 1929, to April 30, 1930.

During that period the hospital served 1,047 patients. In less than a year one hospital served 1,047 patients. Of that number, 430 were Kiowas, 358 were Comanches, 62 were Apaches. Those were the three tribes which are now being taxed.

In addition to those three tribes this hospital cared for 79 Caddos; it cared for 40 Wichitas, 11 Delawares, 2 Creeks, 4 Pawnees, 7 Shawnees, 6 Cherokees, 1 Sac and Fox, 1 Pueblo, 1 Pottawotomie, 4 Cheyennes, 3 Kaws, 5 Arapahoes, 1 Tonkawa, 1 Miami, 7 Choctaws, 1 Iowa, 1 Hopi, 1 Spanish, 1 Mexican, and 20 whites.

Mr. President, some of the papers on yesterday made the statement that I am conducting a filibuster. That is wholly

untrue. If the committee had done as I thought I had a promise the committee would do, I would have occupied no time upon the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. The committee took no action on this other than to report it just as the House passed it. I do not know what the Senator means by saying the committee promised him something.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I perhaps took in too much territory when I said that. Last year the distinguished Senator from Washington was the chairman of the subcommittee, and I thought I had what I termed an implied promise from him.

Mr. SMOOT. I was chairman of the subcommittee a year ago.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Then I had this promise from the chairman of the main committee a year ago, and, knowing the great power a chairman has, I did not think it necessary to do anything else. I am not criticizing the distinguished chairman, because I realize there are cases where even the chairman of a committee can not get a thing done.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say now, if the chairman promised the Senator that this amendment would be made in this bill, I have no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The chairman does not have any point of order against this. This is one case where a point of order would hardly lie.

Mr. SMOOT. I am quite sure it would lie.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I do not say that the chairman promised me he would put this item in the bill, but he said that if I would introduce the amendment, and if I would call it to his attention next year, he would see if some solution could not be worked out.

Mr. SMOOT. The Chair has already ruled that this is subject to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has not ruled on this amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That was on the Pawnee school item.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No point of order has been made against the pending amendment, to strike out \$51,000 as the Chair understands.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The point of order was raised to the Pawnee school item, and the point of order was sustained. This is an amendment to strike out \$51,000, which was to be taken from the Indian trust funds, and put it over against the Federal Treasury fund.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the present amendment should carry, unless provision were made elsewhere so that it would come out of another fund, the amendment would be perfectly useless.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The amendment, I will say to the distinguished Senator, provides that the fund shall be added to the Federal Treasury fund.

I wish again to call the attention of the chairman of the main committee to the record taken before the committee. Mr. Dodd testified as follows:

Their income is about gone. They have no definite tribal assets from which they have any set income, and within two or three years' time the Congress will have to make an outright appropriation for the support of the activities at this point.

I think I have shown that the hypothetical divisions of my question propounded a moment ago have been sustained by the record and by the facts submitted to the Senate.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I have no distinct recollection of making any particular promise in this matter. I do not question the statement of the Senator, however. I have no doubt I assured him that he would have an opportunity to take the matter up. He certainly had an opportunity before the subcommittee. While I am a member of the subcommittee, I was not able to be present at all the meetings of the subcommittee, and I do not know whether the Senator took the matter up with the subcommittee or not. I had the impression that he did, and the subcommittee did not reach

the conclusion that his amendment ought to be included. I certainly have not intended to deceive the Senator at all or to refuse him a full opportunity to present the matter to the committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I made no charge that could be so construed. I gave the substance of the interview as I remembered it, and I refreshed my memory by some letters which I sent immediately after the interview last year, and, as I have stated, that is what happened.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether he sought an opportunity to present this matter to the subcommittee?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I did present it to the subcommittee.

Mr. JONES. The Senator presented the matter to the subcommittee, and that is all the chairman of the committee proposed that he should do.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I knew last year that I would have the right to submit it to the subcommittee. That was no information, that if I would not offer my amendment, I could go before the subcommittee and present it. I knew that before. That was no promise.

Mr. JONES. I certainly could not have promised the Senator to put an item in the bill, because the full committee pass on matters of that kind. All I could promise was to give the Senator full opportunity, and see that he had proper opportunity, to present the matter to the committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the chairman of the committee for his most gracious consideration.

Mr. President, I desire at this point to place in the RECORD some of the sentiments and positions taken by the Indians themselves. I have the privilege of quoting the speeches made by Indians at the conference where there was signed the very treaty in which this land was taken from them.

In 1865, on October 16, the Government sent a commission to Medicine Lodge to treat with these identical Indians, the Kiowas, Comanches, and Apaches. John A. Sanborn, president of the board of commissioners, in addressing the assembled Indians, said:

Chiefs and headsmen of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians, we have been sent here by the Great Father at Washington (President of the United States) for a most important purpose. We have been sent here to represent him and confer with you in regard to your troubles with the whites and settle upon terms of peace, to remove all grounds of complaint from you, and establish a peace that shall be permanent between your tribes and the whites—to mark out a road for you to follow that shall lead to wealth, comfort, and happiness. We are happy to meet you for this purpose and hope that this day will be a new era for good feeling between you and the whites. We shall express the views of the Great Father at Washington and ours fully, and ask that you shall express yours in return.

Our propositions will be such that I have no doubt you as brave and good men will accede to them all, for the Great Father at Washington is still disposed to treat with you with the greatest kindness. All terms that we shall ask you to accede to, we ask because we think they are good and will lead to your happiness.

Many white people have made bitter complaints to the President of the United States and have urged him to make war upon you and punish you severely. This was the case when the Government stock was taken at Fort Larned more than a year ago. These requests have been repeated often by the whites every time a train has been attacked. But notwithstanding all these requests to make war upon you, the Great Father at Washington has looked upon these outbreaks as the acts of children and has refused to send soldiers against you.

Notwithstanding all you have done, he has sent no force against you and has not punished you in return. When last spring attacks on our trains on the Santa Fe road were so frequent, and complaints were made to the President, he called me from a distant field to organize a force and send it against you.

There was the promise made to these plains tribesmen back yonder in 1865, assembled from a broad domain stretching from the Dakotas to the Gulf, from the Mississippi to the Rockies. In that convention the Government, through its plenipotentiaries, made the promise that if they would come and yield and follow in the path outlined for them, they would be led to wealth, comfort, and happiness.

He directed me—

Here is the threat laid before these simple plainsmen. The commissioners were speaking now, telling the Indians

of the orders they had received from the President, the Great White Father—

He directed me to call upon him for soldiers enough and horses enough to cover the plains, and provisions for the year, to stay with you to destroy all the game and do you all the damage possible. Under these orders I went to Fort Larned, and supplies came until I said, "I want no more; I have all I can use." The day I was ready to send troops across the Arkansas, all the way from Fort Lyon down, word came from Colonel Leavenworth, your agent, that you were ready to make peace, and had requested that I should send no troops into your country, and that you should not be disturbed.

This word was immediately sent to the Great Father at Washington, and notwithstanding the great trouble you had caused him, his ear was still open to the call of mercy. Although at that time his soldiers were as numerous as the leaves of the forest or the grass on the prairies and they were scattered from the mountains to the Atlantic, he directed me to stop and proceed to the mouth of the Little Arkansas and see if they wanted peace, and having by his soldiers vanquished all the rest of his enemies, which were five times more numerous than all the Indians in the continent, he sent the soldiers to their homes and did not let them come to fight you. I state these things to you to show you how easy it is for you to have perpetual peace under the directions of the Great Father. All your enemies among the whites represented to the Great Father at Washington that we can never have peace until he has had a war with you and you have suffered like other tribes in the East, but he does not think so; he does not adopt their advice; he remembers the great efforts that have been made for many years by your venerable chief, Ta-hau-son, and others to keep peace, and believes that if you agree now to make peace you will adhere to it and not make war any more.

All your wars bring trouble, uneasiness, and misery upon yourselves. They merely trouble the Great Father slightly as a mosquito troubles a horse or a fly a buffalo, without in any way affecting the Government in its strength or prosperity. If you kill 1,000 whites, we do not miss them, they do not cry; but, if 10 of your people are killed, you miss them and cry.

Those were the orders the commissioners represented they had received from the Great White Father.

Here is the proposition: After making promises and after making threats, after telling these simple people that unless they yield they will be annihilated, this is the proposition:

It is our opinion that your interests require that you shall cede all lands to the Government north of the Canadian River, except that you will be permitted to get salt from the Salt Plains, wander over the country after game by obtaining permission from your agent. The Government is willing to pay you more than you would ask or you would expect. If this is done we propose to give for a reservation the following-described territory, from which white men will be prohibited from entering except on permission from your agent, viz: Commencing on the Canadian River where the eastern line of New Mexico crosses the same, thence running south along said line to the southern boundary of New Mexico, thence in a northeasterly direction to the headwaters of the big Wichita River, thence down said river to its mouth or its junction with Red River, thence due north to the Canadian River, thence up the Canadian to the place of beginning.

We wish to make a treaty of perpetual peace and have you located on ground, on which white men are prohibited from going except traders and agents, to give you full compensation for all you give to the Government—all at once or in spring and autumn that the propositions made the chiefs will talk over among themselves and let us know, now or at the next spring meeting of the council, what they think of them.

It is reported to us that some band has some white prisoners, you would not expect as brave warriors and men, that the Great Father and ourselves would make a treaty with you while you hold any of our people prisoners—compensation will be given you for them. We will now be glad to hear from you and your views.

There is the proposition, if these Indians will go on a smaller reservation then they can go up to the Salt Plains and get the salt they may need and they can wander over the plains and kill game, provided they can get the consent of the Indian agent.

There follows the description of the new reservation. That was the reservation which covered most of Oklahoma and Indian Territory, part of New Mexico, and part of Texas. At a later date the Government found that it owned no land in Texas, and it was necessary to make a smaller reservation and to get these Indians on land to which the Government had at least a color of title; and the next year, 1867, the Indians were called again to this assembling place at Medicine Lodge.

A great group of these plains Indians assembled there at Medicine Lodge, in a natural grove; on the hills surrounding the grove were stationed 1,500 soldiers, with loaded cannon pointed at the grove, and under such surroundings the promises were made these simple people that if they would

agree to go on a smaller reservation they would have all the comforts of civilization, religion, and wealth.

At that time Senator Henderson was in charge of the commission, and I quote from the notes made by the official reporter who reported the convention. The date was October 19, 1867. Senator Henderson said:

Our friends of the Cheyenne, Comanche, Apache, Kiowa, and Arapahoe Nations, the Government of the United States and the Great Father has sent us seven commissioners to come here and have a talk with you. Two years ago the Government entered into a treaty with you at the mouth of the Little Arkansas, and we hoped that there would be no war between us. We are sorry to be disappointed. During the last year we heard several times that persons belonging to your tribes were committing war against us. We heard that they were attacking peaceable persons engaged in building our railroads, that they were scalping women and children. These reports made the hearts of our people very sad. Some of our people said that you committed these deeds, others denied it. Some of our people said that you commenced the war. Some of them denied that you commenced it. Some of our people said that you and other Indians were going to wage a general war against the whites; others denied the charge. In this conflict of opinion we could not find the truth, and therefore the Great Father has sent us here to hear from your own lips what were those wrongs that prompted you to commit those deeds, if you had committed those deeds of violence. We do not like war, because it brings bloodshed to both sides; but we do like brave men, and they should speak the truth, for it is an evidence of their courage. We now again ask you to state to us, if you have at any time since the treaty committed violence.

What has the Government done of which you complain? If soldiers have done wrong to you, tell us when and where, and who are the guilty parties. If these agents whom we have put in here to protect you have cheated and defrauded you, be not afraid to tell us. We have come to hear all your complaints and to correct all your wrongs. We have full power to do these things, and we pledge you our sacred honor to do so. For anything that you may say in this council you shall not be harmed. Before we proceed to inform you what we are authorized to do for you, we desire to hear fully from your own lips what you have done, what you have suffered, and what you want.

This is the promise made by Senator Henderson:

We say, however, that we intend to do justice to the red men.

That has always been the Government's plea, that justice should be done. Representatives of the Government do expect to do justice, but the moment justice conflicts with property, property wins, and justice is flung aside.

If we have harmed you, we will correct it.

I wonder when.

If the red man has harmed us, we believe he is brave and generous enough to acknowledge it, and to cease from doing any more wrong. At present we have only to say that we are greatly rejoiced to see our red brethren so well disposed toward peace. We are especially glad because we, as individuals would give them all the comforts of civilization, religion, and wealth, and now we are authorized by the Great Father to provide for them comfortable homes upon our richest agricultural lands. We are authorized to build for the Indian schoolhouses and churches, and provide teachers to educate his children. We can furnish him agricultural implements to work with and domestic cattle, sheep, and hogs to stock his farm. We now cease and shall wait to hear what you have to say, and after we have heard it we will tell you the road to go. We are now anxious to hear from you.

That was in 1867. We are not even yet building sufficient schools to care for their children. On this floor on Saturday afternoon two propositions for additional schools were denied on a technicality, although we have before us here the recommendations and reports of the only department of the Government which can gather the information, a report of a local agency superintendent, and a report of an inspector of the Department of the Interior. Yet it was denied.

Mr. President, Senator Henderson, when he had completed his address, asked the representatives of the tribes assembled to reply to his address and state their position. Ten Bears, a Comanche, made the first speech.

I have tried to portray that this conference was held in a grove at Medicine Lodge, Kans. These Indians had been assembled there to confer with representatives of the Government.

The Government was trying to get them to accept a smaller reservation, to cede their right to roam the plains, and to go upon a smaller reservation.

At the time the conference was held, cannon were stationed pointed at the grove, and 1,500 soldiers were there

surrounding the camp. I do not know why they were there, but that is the record.

After Senator Henderson had made his promises to the Indians to the effect that if they would accept this reservation they would have wealth, religion, protection, peace, and plenty, he ended by stating that if they did not accept it, they had no option but to fight.

After he had made his presentation, Ten Bears, a Comanche Indian, a member of one of the identical tribes affected by this amendment, made this reply:

My heart is filled with joy when I see you here, as the brooks fill with water when the snow melts in the spring; and I feel glad, as the ponies do when the fresh grass starts in the beginning of the year. I heard of your coming when I was many sleeps away, and I made but few camps when I met you. I know that you had come to do good to me and to my people. I looked for benefits which would last forever, and so my face shines with joy as I look upon you. My people have never first drawn a bow or fired a gun against the whites. There has been trouble on the line between us, and my young men have danced the war dance. But it was not begun by us. It was you to send the first soldier and we who sent out the second. Two years ago I came upon this road, following the buffalo, that my wives and children might have their cheeks plump and their bodies warm. But the soldiers fired on us, and since that time there has been a noise like that of a thunderstorm, and we have not known which way to go. So it was upon the Canadian. Nor have we been made to cry once alone. The blue-dressed soldiers and the Utes came from out of the night when it was dark and still, and for camp fires they lit our lodges. Instead of hunting game they killed my braves, and the warriors of the tribe cut short their hair for the dead. So it was in Texas. They made sorrow come in our camps, and we went out like the buffalo bulls when the cows are attacked. When we found them, we killed them, and their scalps hang in our lodges. The Comanches are not weak and blind, like the pups of a dog when seven sleeps old. They are strong and farsighted, like grown horses. We took their road and we went on it. The white women cried and our women laughed.

But there are things which you have said to me which I do not like. They were not sweet like sugar, but bitter like gourds. You said that you wanted to put us upon a reservation, to build our houses and make us medicine lodges. I do not want them. I was born upon the prairie, where the wind blew free and there was nothing to break the light of the sun. I was born where there were no inclosures and where everything drew a free breath. I want to die there and not within walls. I know every stream and every wood between the Rio Grande and the Arkansas, I have hunted and lived over that country. I lived like my fathers before me, and, like them, I lived happily.

When I was at Washington the Great Father told me that all the Comanches' land was ours and that no one should hinder us in living upon it. So, why do you ask us to leave the rivers and the sun and the wind and live in houses? Do not ask us to give up the buffalo for the sheep. The young men have heard talk of this, and it has made them sad and angry. Do not speak of it more. I love to carry out the talk I get from the Great Father. When I get goods and presents I and my people feel glad, since it shows that he holds us in the eye.

If the Texans had kept out of my country, there might have been peace. But that which you now say we must live on is too small. The Texans have taken away the places where the grass grew the thickest and the timber was the best. Had we kept that, we might have done the things you ask. But it is too late. The white man has the country which we loved, and we only wish to wander on the prairie until we die. Any good thing you say to me shall not be forgotten. I shall carry it as near to my heart as my children, and it shall be as often on my tongue as the name of the Great Father. I want no blood upon my land to stain the grass. I want it all clear and pure, and I wish it so that all who go through among my people may find peace when they come in and leave it when they go out.

Following the speech and reply of Ten Bears we have the speech of a Kiowa, another identical member of this band now affected—Setanta speaking:

SETANTA (a Kiowa). The commissioners have come from afar to listen to our grievances. My heart is glad, and I shall hide nothing from you. I understood that you were coming down here to see us. I moved away from those disposed to war, and I also came from afar to see you. The Kiowas and Comanches have not been fighting. We were away down South when we heard that you were coming to see us.

The Cheyennes are those that have been fighting you. They did it in broad daylight, so that all could see them. If I had been fighting, I would have done so also. Two years ago I made peace with General Harney, Sanborn, and Colonel Leavenworth at the mouth of the Little Arkansas. That peace I have never broken. When the grass was growing this spring a large body of soldiers came along on the Santa Fe road. I had not done anything and therefore was not afraid.

All the chiefs of the Kiowas, Comanches, and Arapahoes are here to-day. They have come to listen to the good word. We have

been waiting here a long time to see you, and we are getting tired. All the land south of the Arkansas belongs to the Kiowas and Comanches, and I don't want to give away any of it. I love the land and the buffalo, and will not part with any. I want you to understand also that the Kiowas don't want to fight and have not been fighting since we made the treaty. I hear a good deal of fine talk from these gentlemen, but they never do what they say.

When I look upon you I know you are all big chiefs. While you are in the country we go to sleep happy and are not afraid. I have heard that you intend to settle us on a reservation near the mountains. I don't want to settle there. I love to roam over the wide prairie, and when I do it I feel free and happy, but when we settle down we grow pale and die.

Hearken well to what I say. I have laid aside my lance, my bow, and my shield, and yet I feel safe in your presence. I have told you the truth. I have no little lies hid about me, but I don't know how it is with the commissioners; are they as clear as I am? A long time ago this land belonged to our fathers, but when I go up to the river I see a camp of soldiers, and they are cutting my wood down or killing my buffalo. I don't like that, and when I see it my heart feels like bursting with sorrow. I have spoken.

Then Silver Brooch, another Indian, spoke as follows:

When the whites made treaty first, I was there and made peace with them. When this war just broke out between the North and the South, all my friends went away and left me alone, and made war against me because I would not go. A-Sha-Hab-Beet came back and made friends with me, and by this and their work this present peace has been made. Last winter when they made treaty in Texas I gave up five prisoners, and the hearts of the whites were glad, and they have given you your prisoners and your hearts are glad. The Texans had some children of mine prisoners, and promised to give them up, but I have not got them yet. When these Indians come in here after doing bad, you give them your hands and hug them, and don't notice me. I have always been for peace. I want you not to forget my prisoners and be sure to get them for me. He came up to the treaty last August and could not get anything.

His head chief went to Fort Smith for goods and could not get any there, so I do not know where I belong.

I came here to see what you would do for me after I have worked so hard for peace. I want to know whether you want me to go on the plains and do like other Indians, and then you will give me present and goods wherever I go. The Great Father at Washington promised me presents some time ago, such as houses, farming utensils, grains, etc., and I have not got mine yet.

I think before I get any of them I will die an old man, as I am pretty old now.

I now quote from a man who was here a few years ago and testified in the identical case that raised the money that is now proposed to be forcibly taken—Oseco, an Apache Indian. Oseco died at the age of probably 90. He was an Indian scout probably 50 or 60 years ago. He made such a favorable record that when his retirement came the Government did not retire him, but furnished him a place to live on the Fort Sill military reservation, furnished him with a uniform and paid him the salary of a sergeant. He wore that uniform until his death. He came here and testified. He was present when this treaty was made. This is what Oseco said:

I was at the Medicine Lodge Council in 1867—they called it "Timber Mountain." It is known to these people as a hill with trees growing up on it. I had been on the warpath against the Navajos way over in New Mexico. I met a small village of Cheyennes who told me that soldiers were coming with beef, sugar, and coffee, and were going to have a big council. I went and heard it. There were many soldiers there. The council was an immense one. There were a great many rows sitting around, row after row there. The soldier chief said, "Here are two propositions: You can live on the Arkansas and fight or move down to the Wichita Mountains and I will help you. Which one will you take?" And all the chiefs chose to move.

I next desire to call the attention of the Senate to a council which the Osage Indians held. This was held in 1868. I call this to the attention of the Senate for the reason that Mr. Sanborn was in charge of this council likewise. At the Osage council which was held in 1865, the president, Mr. Sanborn, addressing the Osage Indians, said:

Chiefs and headmen of the Osage Tribe of Indians, I have called you together to see upon what terms you will sell that part of the Osage reservation lying west of the Arkansas River to the Government of the United States. We desire to know if you will sell at all and on what terms, and wish you to consult with one another and give us an answer as soon as you can determine.

I am submitting this to show the nature of the propositions, promises, bribes, and threats used by the agents of the Government to get the lands from these former original

owners. Strike Ax, one of the Osage Indians, made the following reply:

You can see our people all about you. I am one of the oldest; not too old to talk. The band have selected my son to act in my place as chief, as he is a younger man than me. My people thought it better that a more active man take the place of chief. I agreed. My son that takes my place here is recognized as the third chief of the band; but I am authorized to speak for the tribe. The matter you have talked to us about is a very important one, and I want you and the Great Father at Washington to hear what Strike Ax has to say about it. It is nature to think much of one's children, and Fire Works is my son, and he wants to do what is right.

President Sanborn said:

The Government is disposed to deal kindly and liberally with the red man.

What a change, Mr. President!

Let your people consider this question to-day, and meet us again in council to make known your determination.

Little Bear said:

I have already agreed with the Great Father at Washington twice on this very matter at long intervals. There were some men came from Great Father at Washington like yourself who wanted us to take up arms and fight. This was more than four years ago. I have not seen the money yet. After that two other men came from Washington and made a treaty for part of our land and was to give us money in six months. I have not seen the money yet. Now you want to treat for land. The great difficulty now is in understanding all about this matter.

Strike Ax said:

My friend, you have laid a subject before us worthy of being talked of. You come from the Great Father. More than three years ago you wanted us to fight and promised us money. We have seen no money yet. Shortly after you came from the Great Father and wanted to buy a part of our country which we let him have. The agent told us we should get our money for the land in six months. We have not got it. Now we start on a buffalo hunt to make money. Whilst on the way we meet you here. This is the fourth talk about selling our country to the Government. A heap of talk, but no money.

President Sanborn said:

None of the commissioners have any knowledge of your having been employed to fight. We think it may have been done by some person not sent by the Great Father at Washington. We don't know.

That is the way these Indians were handled. One man would promise them money, promise them anything, promise them everything. Simple-minded as they were, they would sign on the promises, and then, the promises being unfulfilled, when some one was approached the "buck" was passed and they had made no promises.

In reference to the first treaty you speak of I have this to say: It was never ratified by the great council at Washington and was void, and therefore no moneys could be paid you. The last treaty has not yet been ratified by the great council at Washington. If we make a treaty and it is ratified by the great council at Washington, then the money promised will be paid at once, as may be agreed on. The council is adjourned.

There the agent of the Government gave an excuse for not paying the Indians the money, that the treaty had not been ratified by the great council, the Senate of the United States. Now, in the distressed condition among the Indians, when relief is asked, the Indian farmer tells the Indians "We have no money for you."

Congress has not furnished money and the blame is on the Congress. The Indian superintendents tell the same thing, and the Indian Bureau officials in Washington tell the identical selfsame thing.

Little Bear said the next day, Wednesday, October 18, 1865:

We have consulted among ourselves about the matter referred to in the council this morning. My friends, I have consulted my people and am ready to tell you our conclusion. My people tell me that what has heretofore been agreed on between them and our great fathers has not yet been complied with. First, they employed us as soldiers and we got no pay. Over three years ago we made a treaty with the Great Father, with people sent by him, and have not yet seen any money. At the time we made that treaty we agreed to relinquish 20 miles square through our country and got no money. It appears that this will be like that affair. You want to buy the west end of our country and surround us like a pen. My people tell me we have sold a strip off

of the north side of our country and 30 miles off of the east end. We think we had better wait until we get the money for that.

They were learning.

We do not wish to disoblige you, our friends, but think we will wait. Besides many of our chiefs are not with us. There will be a time when we will go back to our village, then we will be all together, and when the grass is green, then you can bring this matter up. I have now said what my people have wished me to say.

President SANBORN. Our object was to ascertain the views of your tribe. In the event the Government should desire to purchase part of this reserve. If they had any proposition to make, we should be glad to receive it, and submit it to our Government for consideration. It is as well as it is. At the proper time the Government can take the matter up. We are satisfied.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have been waiting for an opportunity to present a small amendment, to which I imagine there will be no objection. I wonder if the Senator from Oklahoma would yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I will yield only on condition that I do not lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator from Oklahoma yields by unanimous consent he will not lose the floor. In the absence of unanimous consent he can only yield for a question. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say there is an amendment now pending.

Mr. SMOOT. I inquire if that is the amendment to the pending bill about which the Senator spoke to me?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It is an amendment contemplating an appropriation of \$15,000 to complete the boarding school at the Blackfeet Agency as authorized by the general act.

Mr. SMOOT. The only difficulty about considering the amendment now is that there is already an amendment pending.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has stated there is an amendment pending.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Then, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment submitted by me may be considered notwithstanding the pending amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the pending amendment will be laid aside temporarily for the purpose of considering the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana, which will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. After the numerals "\$10,000," on page 43, line 9, it is proposed to insert:

Completing Blackfeet boarding school, \$15,000, authorized by the act approved May 15, 1930.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, does the Senator from Oklahoma now desire to enter upon another subject?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No. I am going to portray the condition of the Indians in my section of the State, but I am not nearly through.

Mr. SMOOT. I meant has the Senator completed his discussion of the tribes of Indians to which he has been referring for some little time?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The condition that obtains among these tribes obtains among the other tribes of the country; and I feel that I am serving them, as well as the particular three tribes in my State, when I portray the conditions that exist in the Indian Service.

Mr. SMOOT. I merely wanted to know whether the Senator had concluded his remarks in regard to the tribes about

which he has been speaking. So I desire to move a recess until to-morrow at 11 o'clock. That is all I had in view.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield for such a motion.

INVESTIGATION OF CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, on yesterday I asked unanimous consent for the consideration of Senate Resolution 403 directing the Nye campaign investigating committee to make a certain investigation. The two Senators who then objected have since assured me that they now have no objection to the passage of the resolution. I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered and adopted at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the resolution be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution submitted by Mr. GLASS on January 5 (calendar day, January 16), 1931, as follows:

Resolved, That the special committee of the Senate to investigate campaign expenditures, created under authority of Senate Resolution 215, adopted April 10, 1930, is hereby further authorized and directed to investigate any complaint made before such committee by any responsible person or persons, alleging (1) the violation, at any time within two years preceding the adoption of the aforesaid resolution, of any provision of the Federal corrupt practices act, 1925, involving a false statement of campaign expenditures, or (2) a fraudulent conversion to private uses, at any time within such period of two years, of any campaign funds contributed for use in any election as defined in the Federal corrupt practices act, 1925. The committee shall investigate fully the allegations in all such complaints, and shall, as soon as practicable, make a full report thereon to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, is this the resolution to which the Senator from Nebraska offered an amendment?

Mr. GLASS. No; it is a separate resolution entirely.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE

A message in writing from the President of the United States making nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

SENATOR FROM TENNESSEE

Mr. McKELLAR presented the credentials of CORDELL HULL, chosen a Senator from the State of Tennessee for the term commencing March 4, 1931, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 1930, CORDELL HULL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Tennessee a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1931.

Witness: His excellency our governor, Henry H. Horton, and our seal hereto affixed at Nashville, Tenn., this 15th day of January, 1931.

HENRY H. HORTON, Governor.

By the governor:
[SEAL.]

ERNEST N. HORTON,
Secretary of State.

PRINTING OF CREDENTIALS IN THE RECORD

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I want to call attention to the omission from the RECORD of Monday, December 8, 1930, of a certain matter. The Vice President then laid before the Senate the credentials of several Senators who were chosen to serve in the Senate for the term commencing March 4, 1931. Those Senators were the Senators elect from Massachusetts, from Georgia, from Illinois, and from Louisiana. I am informed it has been the practice and custom to set forth in the RECORD such credentials in full. They were noted in the RECORD, but not printed in full. I now ask unanimous consent that those several credentials may be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done.

The credentials referred to are as follows:

SENATOR FROM MASSACHUSETTS

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, Greeting:

This is to certify that, on the 4th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1930, MARCUS A. COOLIDGE was duly chosen by the

qualified voters of said Commonwealth a Senator, to represent said Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the Senate of the United States, for the term of six years, commencing on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1931.

Witness: His excellency, Frank G. Allen, our governor, and our great seal, hereunto affixed, at Boston, this 3d day of December in the year of our Lord 1930, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and fifty-fifth.

FRANK G. ALLEN.

By his excellency the governor:
[SEAL.]

F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

SENATOR FROM GEORGIA

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 1930, WILLIAM J. HARRIS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Georgia a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1931.

Witness: His excellency our governor, L. G. Hardman, and our seal hereto affixed at the capitol in Atlanta, this 24th day of November, A. D. 1930.

L. G. HARDMAN,
Governor.
GEO. H. CARSWELL,
Secretary of State.

SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS

STATE OF ILLINOIS.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 1930, JAMES HAMILTON LEWIS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Illinois a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1931.

Witness: His excellency our governor, Louis L. Emmerson, and our seal hereto affixed at Springfield this 2d day of December, A. D. 1930.

LOUIS L. EMMERSON, Governor.

By the governor:
[SEAL.]

WILLIAM J. STRATTON,
Secretary of State.

SENATOR FROM LOUISIANA

STATE OF LOUISIANA, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 1930, HUEY P. LONG was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Louisiana a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1931.

Witness: His excellency our governor, HUEY P. LONG, and our seal hereto affixed at Baton Rouge this 1st day of December, A. D. 1930.

HUEY P. LONG,
Governor.

By the governor:
[SEAL.]

ALICE LEE GROSJEAN,
Secretary of State.

PETITIONS

Mr. COPELAND presented petitions numerously signed by sundry citizens of New York City, N. Y., praying for the passage of legislation for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Fleet Reserve Association, Branch No. 2, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the prompt payment of adjusted-compensation certificates of ex-service men, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JONES presented resolutions adopted by the Tacoma (Wash.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the prompt passage of any proposed legislation that will assist in stabilizing the medium of exchange sponsored by the Government of China, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions numerously signed by sundry citizens of the State of Washington, praying for the passage of legislation for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAPPER presented resolutions adopted by the Chambers of Commerce of Coffeyville, Ellsworth, and Pratt, all in the State of Kansas, favoring the passage of legislation imposing a duty on crude petroleum and its refined products, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TYDINGS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Easton, Md., praying for the ratification of the World Court protocols, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 5069) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to deliver to the State of Utah the silver service which was in use on the battleship *Utah*, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1319) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 5288) to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1322) thereon.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4907) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Princeton Club, of Philadelphia, the bowl and ladle formerly in use on the U. S. S. *Princeton*, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1320) thereon.

Mr. BRATTON, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 357) classifying certain official mail matter, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1321) thereon.

REPORTS OF NOMINATIONS

As in executive session,

Mr. DILL, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of J. Whitaker Thompson, of Pennsylvania, to be United States circuit judge, third circuit (additional position), which was placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of David H. Kincheloe, of Kentucky, to be a judge of the United States Customs Court, which was placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. HEBERT, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Frank Martinez, of New York, to be United States attorney, district of Porto Rico, which was placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. ASHURST, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of William H. Sawtelle, of Arizona, to be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit, which was placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Herbert E. L. Toombs, of Texas, to be United States marshal, southern district of Texas, which was placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. PHIPPS, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably sundry post-office nominations, which were placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. NYE, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, reported favorably the following nominations, which were placed on the Executive Calendar:

Albert G. Stubblefield, of Colorado, to be register of the land office at Pueblo, Colo. (reappointment); and

William Ashley, of Idaho, to be register of the land office at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho (reappointment).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WATSON (for Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana):

A bill (S. 5766) granting an increase of pension to Mary Bradley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DILL:

A bill (S. 5767) granting a pension to William H. Rader; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL:

A bill (S. 5768) authorizing the cities of Omaha, Nebr., and Council Bluffs, Iowa, and the counties of Douglas, Nebr., and Pottawattamie, Iowa, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll or free bridge across the Missouri River, at or near O'Hern Street, South Omaha, Nebr.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

A bill (S. 5769) to authorize appropriations in aid of the expansion and operation of George R. Smith College, Sedalia, Mo., for the higher education of negroes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 5770) granting a pension to Henry Coonce (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 5771) authorizing the promotion of certain officers of the Staff Corps of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 5772) for the relief of David W. Cameron; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas:

A bill (S. 5773) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry on agricultural-extension work within drought areas where counties are unable to make contribution; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BROOKHART:

A bill (S. 5774) granting a pension to Agnes Messenger (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALCOTT:

A bill (S. 5775) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Odell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 5777) to authorize the exchange of rights of way, the transfer of lands, and the closing and opening of certain streets in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 5778) authorizing United States courts to modify or dismiss temporary injunctions or temporary restraining orders without concurrence of any other judge or judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 5779) for the relief of Capt. Jacob M. Pearce, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DALE:

A bill (S. 5780) placing service postmasters in the classified service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. GLENN:

A bill (S. 5781) granting to the commissioners of Lincoln Park the right to erect a breakwater in the navigable waters of Lake Michigan and transferring jurisdiction over certain navigable waters of Lake Michigan to the commissioners of Lincoln Park; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. REED:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 236) to authorize the acceptance on behalf of the United States of the bequest of the late William F. Edgar, of Los Angeles County, State of California, for the benefit of the museum and library connected with the office of the Surgeon General of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADVANCE PLANNING AND REGULATED CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill and ask that it be printed and lie upon the table, because I desire to make a request of the Senate in reference thereto to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The bill (S. 5776) to provide for the advance planning and regulated construction of public works, for the stabilization of industry, and for aiding in the prevention of unemployment during periods of business depression, was read twice by its title and ordered to lie on the table.

AMENDMENT TO WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SWANSON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$30,000 for expenses of the United States Army to participate in the Yorktown (Va.) sesquicentennial celebration, etc., intended to be proposed by him to House bill

15593, the War Department appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. KEAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 15592, the first deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

At the proper place in the bill insert the following:

"The appropriation 'Aviation, Navy, 1929,' act of May 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 636), is hereby made available in such sum as may be necessary, but not exceeding \$7,023.71, for settlement by the Comptroller General of the United States on principles of equity and justice the claims of the U. S. Hammered Piston Ring Co., under contract with the Navy Department No. N-156a-4703, dated June 10, 1929."

INVESTIGATION OF RETAIL PRICES OF MEAT AND MEAT FOOD PRODUCTS

Mr. CAREY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 407), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to investigate and report to the Senate the reasons for the failure of the retail price paid by the consumer for meat and meat food products to reflect the decline in the price received by the producer and the packer for such meat and meat food products, and particularly whether such failure is a result of a combination in restraint of trade.

Such investigation shall be conducted in connection with the investigation authorized by Senate Resolution 374, adopted January 16, 1931; and such committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may exercise all the powers expressly conferred thereon by such resolution in order to carry out the purposes of this resolution.

SURVEY OF COOPERATIVE CREDIT LAWS AND SYSTEMS

Mr. BROOKHART submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 408), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That in order to provide for a more effective use and control of credit for cooperative enterprises as distinguished from competitive, the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, be, and is hereby, empowered and directed to make a complete survey of the cooperative credit laws and systems and a full compilation of the essential facts and to report the result of its findings as soon as practicable, together with such recommendations for legislation as the committee deems advisable. The inquiry thus authorized and directed is to comprehend specifically the desirability of a cooperative banking system with respect to the use of its facilities for curbing and preventing speculation and encouraging and developing cooperative organization.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions and recesses of the Seventy-first and succeeding Congresses until the final report is submitted, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony, and make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$15,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

A message in writing from the President of the United States making sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDRESS ON "ROBERT EDWARD LEE, SOLDIER AND SAINT"

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I present for publication in the RECORD an address delivered by Rev. Dr. Kerr Boyce Tupper, of Philadelphia, before the Annie Coleman Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, in Orlando, Fla., on the 15th instant, upon the birthday of Robert Edward Lee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Reverend Doctor Tupper spoke, in part, as follows:

In a noble stone mansion, which had come down from a remote past to the Lee family, there was born on January 19, 1807, a comely child destined to achieve a name and fame as one of the heroic figures of American history. On this one hundred and twenty-fourth anniversary of this auspicious birth our fair Southland delights to pay loyal and loving tribute to Robert Edward

Lee, matchless soldier and Christian hero—"a foe without hate, a friend without treachery, a warrior without cruelty," a public officer without vice, a private officer without wrong, a neighbor without selfishness, a Christian without hypocrisy, a man without guile, the embodiment of what is both good and great, the incarnation of the true, the beautiful, and the just. Now, forever enfolded in the glory of the life beyond life, Lee abides among—

"Those immortal dead
That live again in lives
Made better by their presence
Live in thoughts that pierce the night like stars
And, by their mild persistence, lead
Men's minds to vaster issues."

Just as in St. Paul's in London, visitors gather from time to time, in large numbers, to gaze with appreciative gratitude upon the monument erected to Chinese Gordon, so deserving of the fine eulogy cut into the stone above his ashes, so, at the simple yet eloquent burial spot in the chapel of the college of which he was president, countless men and women stand yearly in sympathetic love of the chieftain of the South, Robert E. Lee.

"Such graves as his are pilgrim shrines—
Shrines to no sect nor creed confined—
The Delphian vales, the Palestines,
The Meccas of the mind."

When, in 1852, the historian, Motley, then abroad, learned of the death of Daniel Webster, he wrote to his father: "To think of America without Webster is like thinking of her without Niagara." To this fine sentence may not inaptly be added: To think of the South without Lee is like thinking of England without the Duke of Wellington, or of Sweden without Gustavus Adolphus. For here was a man who incarnated the very soul of what is strongest and noblest in our fair domain, as, also, of what is most virile and vigorous in American life. When, on that memorable October day in 1870, General Lee exchanged his sword of warfare on earth for his chaplet of victory on high, there passed from the stage of human action, not only a magnetic personality, but, also, a mighty moral force, a splendid granitic character. Here was a chivalric soul, reminding one of the noble Knights of King Arthur's Court, and, yet, with a finer stamp and type of manliness than ever witnessed in the fourteenth century knighthood.

How symmetrically educated was Robert E. Lee! For what is education? Let Herbert Spencer answer with his comprehensive statement: "True education is the full development of integral personality." And mark six glorious elements in Lee's development: A strong body, surcharged with vitality and vigor; a well developed and cultivated intellect; a warm heart of sympathy and sensibility; a masterful will; a rich imagination; and an exalted spirit of mingled reverence and service. Lee matched creed with deed. He buttressed doctrine with doing. He made effective speech by service. His was a rounded, completed, golden purified manhood—himself no haloed saint, but every inch a man.

Five specific elements there were in Robert Edward Lee which made him what he was for a quarter of a century, a commanding personality in American life as well as a colossal figure among the soldiers of the world.

In the first place, there was a noble ancestry that lay back of his career of honor and of usefulness; and who knows not that, as in horses so in men, blood tells, pedigree counts. Of a famous family both in England and in America, Lee represented many strains of noble race descent—himself a notable illustration of the resistless potency of noble heredity. This needs but little discussion.

In the second place, Robert E. Lee was gifted with a personality alike persuasive and potent. This was fundamental in the great man's character and career, its relation to all else in his being, the relation of fountain to stream, of foundation to superstructure. We can not define personality, even as Newton could not define gravity, nor Clark Maxwell electricity. No rule can measure it; no definition can encompass it; no psychologist, however gifted, can explain it—this subtle, invisible, intangible, impalpable something which, though escaping analysis, nevertheless makes itself universally and most potentially felt. Lee had no more need to tell of his pedigree or mental or moral ingredients than a lighthouse needs to ring a bell to call attention to its brightness. Everything and everybody seemed to love Lee, this follower of Him whom Coleridge designates as "the first true gentleman that ever lived." Few men had more of that genuine generosity which may be described as benevolence in small things than Robert E. Lee. "There is no alchemy by which one can get golden conduct out of leaden instincts," once said a wise man; and General Lee's conduct was golden, because his instincts were of that same beautiful quality. His transfigured inward being revealed itself in transformed outward action. There must be involution precedent to evolution. Service presupposes a servant. Finely executed doing comes from a finely equipped doer. Lee had in his soul beautiful visions, which he translated into daily life.

In the third place, what a masterful military genius was Lee; in the estimation of so distinguished a student of war as was Major General Maurice, of England, worthy to have his name enrolled alongside those of Alexander, of Caesar, of Hannibal, of Napoleon, and of Frederick the Great. It is not insignificant, indeed most suggestive, that Theodore Roosevelt paid tribute to General Lee as the very greatest general ever developed among English-speaking people. To the great Virginian's leadership of men on the fields of battle, Chancellorsville and Fredericksville bear un-

questioned testimony. A noted British leader declares that "The Army of Northern Virginia died only with its annihilation." The truth is Lee was a born general, even as Richelieu was a born diplomatist, and Gladstone a born statesman, and Tennyson a born poet.

In the fourth place, more than a cultivated gentleman, a military genius, an educational leader, General Lee was a man of the highest moral stamina. He possessed what Aristotle calls *ethos*—moral weight. His was the substance of life when you have blown off the chaff. His was devotion to right in a large way and on a general scale. He stood on the platform of a genuine self-respect. He had those high transcendent virtues which are the girdle of a man's strength and the garment of his beauty. Pascal's noted word was virtue, Rothschild's integrity, Nelson's glory, Garrison's freedom, Jefferson's democracy. Lee's sovereign word was duty; and into any abyss that duty led Robert Edward Lee followed with faith and courage.

In the fifth place, General Lee was a consecrated Christian who honored religion by his virtues as he had honored the profession of war by his renown. He had religion, but not religiosity, which is but the marble effigy of entombed religion. Prayer was the man's vital breath, his native air, as it was with Chinese Gordon. To Robert E. Lee, God was always and resistlessly near, real, visible by the eye of faith, tangible to the hand of trust. Far more than many realized, the great general, especially amid the crises and calamities of life, lived beyond the sense realm, behind the veil that separates the seen from the unseen. As with Cromwell and Gladstone, the supernatural was tremendously a fact with Lee. Jehovah was the inspiration of his strength. The God of Lee was the God of the Victorian laureate, nearer than breathing, closer than hand and feet. Here was a man who was "Christed," as Bushnell would say; his life "eternalized," to quote Dante's fine phrase; himself "enskyed and sainted," to use Shakespeare's immortal words.

Such, in brief, are the character and the career of Robert Edward Lee, whose memory will abide in the world's admiration and love long after temples of stone and monuments of brass have crumbled into dust, abide—

"Till the stars grow old and the sun grows cold,
And the leaves of the Judgment Book unfold."

RECESS

Mr. SMOOT. I now move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 20, 1931, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 19 (legislative day of January 5), 1931

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

The following-named persons for promotion in the Foreign Service of the United States, as follows:

From Foreign Service officer of class 2 to Foreign Service officer of class 1:

Charles M. Hathaway, jr., of Pennsylvania.
Arthur Bliss Lane, of New York.
Samuel T. Lee, of Michigan.
J. Theodore Marriner, of Maine.

From Foreign Service officer of class 3 to Foreign Service officer of class 2:

Thomas M. Wilson, of Tennessee.

From Foreign Service officer of class 4 to Foreign Service officer of class 3:

Erle R. Dickover, of California.

From Foreign Service officer of class 5 to Foreign Service officer of class 4:

Charles E. Allen, of Kentucky.
George L. Brandt, of the District of Columbia.
John Dewey Hickerson, of Texas.
Robert D. Murphy, of Wisconsin.
Harold B. Quarton, of Iowa.
John Randolph of New York.

From Foreign Service officer of class 6 to Foreign Service officer class 5:

Howard Bucknell, jr., of Georgia.
Howard K. Travers, of New York.

From Foreign Service officer of class 7 to Foreign Service officer of class 6:

Gilson G. Blake, jr., of Maryland.
Curtis T. Everett, of Tennessee.
Robert F. Fernald, of Maine.
Sydney B. Redecker, of New York.

Laurence E. Salisbury, of Illinois.

Edwin F. Stanton, of California.

From Foreign Service officer of class 8 to Foreign Service officer of class 7:

Howard A. Bowman, of New York.

John H. Bruins, of New York.

Joseph F. Burt, of Illinois.

William W. Corcoran, of Massachusetts.

C. Paul Fletcher, of Tennessee.

Austin R. Preston, of New York.

Edwin Schoenrich, of Maryland.

Winfield H. Scott, of the District of Columbia.

George E. Seltzer, of New York.

Sheridan Talbott, of Kentucky.

From Foreign Service officer, unclassified at \$3,000 to Foreign Service officer of class 8; and from vice consul of career to consul:

Franklin B. Atwood, of Massachusetts.

J. Holbrook Chapman, of the District of Columbia.

Cabot Coville, of California.

Walton C. Ferris, of Wisconsin.

Fayette J. Flexer, of Illinois.

Knowlton V. Hicks, of New York.

Joseph P. Ragland, of the District of Columbia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 19, 1931

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Teach us Thy way, O Lord, and lead us in a plain path. Let us hear the inner voice; let it touch our souls with the fervor of divine aspiration; put its rhythmic note into our best thoughts and into our best hopes. We beseech Thee to be with the officers and Members of this Congress, for serving our country is a divine vocation and their labor is a sacred calling. Father in Heaven, let not our good be evil spoken of. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 17, 1931, was read and approved.

ALASKA GAME LAW

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

The first business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11285) to amend the Alaska game law.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill has been passed over on several occasions at my request. On the last consent day I had not had an opportunity to examine it in detail, and stated then that I would try to find time before the next calendar day to go over the details of the bill. I had that opportunity yesterday, and I find that the proposed bill is merely a modification in certain particulars of existing law. When I first examined the bill I thought it was an outrageous fee to charge aliens \$500 for the privilege of fishing and hunting in Alaska, but I find on comparing the bill with existing law that that fee is the same as in existing law. Therefore, I withdraw the reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to establish an Alaska Game Commission to protect game animals, land fur-bearing animals, and birds in Alaska, and for other purposes," approved January 13, 1925 (43 Stat. 739), is amended under the definition "game animals" following the comma after the word "bears," by adding the words "and such other game as have been or may hereafter be introduced," and under the definition "game birds" following the comma after the word "ptarmigan," by adding the words "and such other birds as have been or may hereafter be introduced."

Sec. 2. That section 3 of the act is amended by striking out in line 3 thereof the words "not less than one year," and following

the comma in line 4 thereof by adding the words "for not less than one year immediately preceding his claim for resident privileges."

SEC. 3. That section 5 of the act is amended by striking out the sentence beginning with the word "any" in line 23 thereof and ending in line 29, and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Any officer or employee empowered to enforce this act shall have authority without warrant to search any camp, camp outfit, pack or pack animals, automobile, wagon, or other vehicle, sled, or any boat, vessel, or other craft, in the Territorial waters of the United States, or any boat, vessel, or other craft of the United States on the high seas when such officer or employee has reasonable cause to believe that such camp, camp outfit, pack or pack animals, automobile, wagon, or other vehicle, sled, boat, vessel, or other craft has therein or thereon any of the animals or birds, or parts thereof, protected by this act, taken, possessed, sold, intended for sale, or transported contrary to law."

SEC. 4. That section 8 of said act is amended by inserting after the word "owners," in line 15 thereof, the words "in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture."

SEC. 5. That section 10 of said act is amended by striking out in line 25 thereof the words "or other commercial mess house." That section 10 is further amended by adding at the end of said section the following: "Provided, That no person shall knowingly disturb, injure, or destroy any notice, signboard, seal, boat, vessel, sled, dog, or dog team, paraphernalia, or equipment, building, or other improvement or property of the United States used by the commission in the administration and/or enforcement of the provisions of this act, or as a notice to the public concerning the provisions of this act or any regulation adopted pursuant thereto, or as a marker of the boundary of any area closed to hunting, trapping, or other special use under the provisions of this act, or to destroy, remove, tamper with, or imitate any metal seal or seals issued by the commission and attached to any skin, portion, or specimen of a wild animal or bird or other article for purposes of identification under its authority, in accordance with the provisions of this act or any regulation thereunder."

SEC. 6. That subdivision B of section 11 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"Subdivision B. Resident export license and permit: That no resident of the Territory shall transport therefrom any game animal, bird, or part thereof, unless he has (a) a resident export and return license, which will entitle him to transport out of the Territory for mounting and return to him in the Territory within one year such game animal, bird, or part thereof, as shall have been legally acquired by him and which shall be specifically identified in license, or (b) a resident export permit, which may be issued by the commission in its discretion, and which will entitle him to export from the Territory for other than return, but not for sale, such game animal, bird, or part thereof, as shall have been legally acquired by him and which shall be specifically identified in the permit."

SEC. 7. That subdivision C of section 11 of said act is amended by striking out "2" where it first occurs therein and by inserting in lieu thereof "1," and by adding after the word "franchise" in line 10 thereof a colon, and the words "or of residents under the age of 16: Provided, That a licensed trapper shall be entitled to the privilege of hunting without a hunting license," and by striking out the word "sixty" and "adoption" in line 11 thereof and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "ninety" and "publication," respectively.

SEC. 8. That subdivision D section 11 of said act is amended by striking out in lines 5 and 6 thereof the words "in a book which it shall keep" and insert in lieu thereof the words "on a form which it shall provide."

SEC. 9. That subdivision F of section 11 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"Subdivision F. Records, reports: Each person to whom a license is issued to take animals or birds, or to deal in furs, shall keep records which shall show the kind and number of each species of animals or birds so taken, purchased, or otherwise procured under such license, the persons from whom they were purchased and to whom they were sold, date of purchase or sale, name of the trapper, and the number of the trapper's license, and shall, on or before 30 days after the expiration of his license, make a written report to the commission on a form prepared and furnished by it setting forth in full the data herein required to be recorded. Such records shall at all reasonable times be subject to inspection and examination by a member of the commission and any of its employees and by any marshal or deputy marshal. Any licensee who shall fail correctly to keep such records or who shall fail to submit such report or who shall in any such report knowingly falsely state any such data or who shall refuse to exhibit his records for inspection and examination as herein required shall be punished as prescribed in section 15 of this act."

SEC. 10. That, effective July 1, 1931, subdivision H of section 11 of said act is amended by inserting after the word "franchise" in line 8 thereof the following: "or of cooperative stores operated exclusively by and for native Indians, Eskimos, or half-breeds, or of stores operated by missions exclusively for native Indians, Eskimos, or half-breeds: Provided, That the stores exempted from procuring licenses as herein provided shall, on or before 30 days after the expiration of each license year as specified in this act, make a written statement to the commission on a form prepared and furnished by it setting forth such material facts concerning the management and operation of such store as the commission may by such form require and in addition thereto shall keep the records, make the reports, incur the penalties, and in all other respects be subject to the requirements of subdivision F of section

11 to the same extent as licensed for dealers," and by striking out all after the colon in line 14 thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) If the applicant is a resident of the Territory, \$10; or is an association or copartnership composed exclusively of residents of the Territory, organized under the laws of the Territory, for each member, \$10.

"(b) If the applicant is a nonresident of the Territory who is a citizen of the United States, or is a corporation composed exclusively of citizens of the United States, organized under the laws of the Territory or of a State of the United States, or is an association or copartnership composed exclusively of citizens of the United States, organized under the laws of the Territory or of a State of the United States, any member of which is a nonresident of the Territory, \$100.

"(c) If the applicant is an alien, or is a corporation, association, or copartnership, not organized under the laws of the Territory or of a State of the United States, or is a corporation, association, or copartnership, any stockholder or member of which is an alien, \$500.

"(d) If the applicant is a resident of the Territory and an agent in charge of a station of a fur dealer of either of the classes (a), (b), or (c), or a resident itinerant agent of such dealer, \$10.

"(e) If the applicant is a nonresident of the Territory but a citizen of the United States and an agent in charge of a station of a fur dealer of either of the classes (a), (b), or (c), or a nonresident citizen itinerant agent of such dealer, \$100.

"(f) If the applicant is an alien and an agent in charge of a station of a fur dealer of either of the classes (a), (b), or (c), or an alien itinerant agent of such dealer, \$500: Provided, That no license shall be issued to any agent whose principal has not procured a license in accordance with (a), (b), or (c)."

SEC. 11. That, effective July 1, 1931, Subdivision I of section 11 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"Subdivision I. Fees and applications for, and issuance of, licenses and permits.—Licenses and resident export permits shall be issued by the commission through its members, game wardens, and other persons authorized by it in writing to sell licenses. Resident export licenses and permits may also be issued by customs officers. Application blanks for licenses and permits shall be furnished by the commission and shall be in such form as the commission may by regulation determine. Each application shall be subscribed and sworn to by the applicant before an officer authorized to administer oaths in the Territory. Members of the commission and its game wardens and other persons authorized in writing by it to issue licenses, and postmasters and customs officers, are hereby authorized to administer such oaths. The applicant for a license or resident export permit shall accompany his application with a license or permit fee as follows: Nonresident general hunting and trapping license, \$50; nonresident small-game hunting license, \$10; resident export and return license, \$1 for each trophy; resident export permit, if removing residence, \$1 for each animal, \$1 for each bird; if otherwise, \$5 for each animal, \$1 for each bird; registered guide license, \$10; alien special license, \$100; and fur-farm license, \$2."

SEC. 12. Section 13 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Provided, That no action in rem shall be required with respect to any wild animal or bird, or part thereof, or any gun, net, trap, or other device possessed or used in or in aid of a violation of this act and legally seized when the claimant thereof releases such article or articles to the United States by a voluntary release in writing witnessed by two disinterested parties, in which case such articles shall be disposed of by the commission, and if sold the proceeds shall be disposed of as provided in this section."

SEC. 13. Section 15 of said act is amended by striking out all the words between the semicolons in lines 7 and 10 thereof and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and, in addition thereto, any person convicted of a violation of any provision of this act who is the holder of any form of license issued thereunder shall thereupon forfeit said license and shall surrender it upon demand of any person authorized by the commission to receive it, and upon a second conviction he shall not be entitled to, nor shall he be granted, a license of such form for a period of one year from date of such forfeiture, and upon a third or successive conviction, for a period of five years from the date of such forfeiture; and any cooperative store operated exclusively by and for native Indians, Eskimos, or half-breeds, or any store operated by missions exclusively for native Indians, Eskimos, or half-breeds, without a license as provided in this act, upon a second or third conviction for violation of this act, shall not be entitled to engage in the business of dealing in furs for such time as the court before whom such conviction is had may decide: Provided, That such prohibition shall not be imposed for the first conviction, nor for a period in excess of one year from date of the second conviction, nor for a period in excess of five years from date of the third or any subsequent conviction."

SEC. 14. Section 16 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 16. Administration of oaths for purposes of prosecution.—Coordination of fiscal business: That such officers, agents, or employees of the Secretary of Agriculture or the Alaska Game Commission as may be designated in writing by said Secretary or commission for the purpose are hereby authorized and empowered to administer to or take from any person, an oath, affirmation, or affidavit whenever such oath, affirmation, or affidavit is for use in any prosecution or proceeding under or in the enforcement of this act; and, in order to coordinate the fiscal business of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Alaska Game Commis-

sion in Alaska, the ex officio commissioner of said department in Alaska designated by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the authority contained in the act of February 10, 1927 (44 Stat., pt. 2, p. 1068), with the approval of said commission, may assign a bonded disbursing officer of said department stationed in Alaska to perform and discharge, without additional compensation, so much of the duties imposed and conferred upon the executive officer of said commission by this act as consist of the disbursement and receipt of public funds; and during the continuation of such assignment the bond of such executive officer required by section 6 of this act shall be reduced to \$1,000, and the bond of the disbursing officer so assigned shall be increased by the amount of \$20,000, the premium for such additional amount to be paid as provided for in said section 6 of this act."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out the word "game" and insert the word "animals."

Page 6, line 17, strike out the word "for" and insert the word "fur."

The committee amendments were agreed to; and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SALARIES OF CLERKS IN IMMIGRATION SERVICE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10881) to amend section 24 of the immigration act of 1917, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that this bill is a salary raising bill, and ought to be considered under the rules of the House on a regular calendar day. I do not think they ought to bring up a bill to raise salaries under unanimous consent.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Immigration has not had a Calendar Wednesday since 1922. The prospects for having a Calendar Wednesday are very uncertain.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman might also add that this does not increase salaries. It is simply an adjustment for this one service to make the various clerical positions comparable with like services in other departments.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman contend that in these days when we are hard pressed for money we should provide for the salary of a typist at \$2,300 a year?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It depends upon how long she has been in the service.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is saying just exactly what I was going to say myself. I do not think this is any time to raise salaries.

Mr. JENKINS. That is hardly a fair statement. There is no question but that this class of employees is the poorest paid in the whole of the field services of the Government, and I defy anybody to dispute that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, I challenge that statement. The gentleman does not mean to say that typists in any department other than the specially preferred Customs Service are paid \$2,300 a year. The comparable salary in private employment is about \$1,200 a year, with a maximum of \$1,500. You are now attempting to provide for a typist, not a stenographer, at a maximum salary of \$2,300 a year.

Mr. JENKINS. That is hardly a fair statement. The gentleman is speaking of the maximum after seven years of experience, and after recommendation for gradual promotions from her superior. The typist the gentleman has reference to is a person who takes dictation at a trial, and that service is comparable to the service of the court stenographer in a civil court. That typist has the responsibility of taking notes and transcribing them correctly and of attending hearings which are comparable to court hearings.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let me read from the bill just what it does provide.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Just one moment. Let me make one suggestion. I raised this objection for the reason that when you come to adjusting salaries between one class and another, there is always an argument about whether you are

fixing the proper rate and whether it is comparable to what is paid others. I do not think salaries ought to be adjusted under unanimous consent. I think the matter ought to come up under the rules of the House so that it can be properly debated.

Mr. CRAMTON. And further, if the gentleman will permit, since it is a matter of salary fixing for employees, why should not this class of employees be considered with other employees of the Government by the Civil Service Committee of this House which, as I understand it, has a general study under way.

Mr. GREENWOOD. If the gentleman will permit at that point I think that he is exactly right, but I reserved the right to object, because you can not, by unanimous consent, go into all of these differences and distinctions and it ought to come up in the regular way. I do not think it should be passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In reply to the suggestion made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] I want to say these employees have been waiting for some committee to take up their cases, and I served with some of them 23 years ago, and they are still waiting to have their salaries adjusted.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I say that the Committee on Civil Service of the House of Representatives is making that investigation at present. Now, in answer to the statement made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] as to the character of duties performed, let us read what the bill says:

Clerks whose duties consist of routine tasks and clerks whose duties consist wholly or mainly of typing or operating mechanical office devices, grades \$1,600 to \$2,300, automatically promoted.

How can we justify paying a mere typist \$2,300 when in private employment, in New York or anywhere else, they do not receive any such salary?

Mr. GREENWOOD. There is hardly a week passes but what some Member of Congress is importuned by some one to try to straighten out inequalities of salary in every department of this Government. The Committee on the Civil Service ought not to bring them in here piecemeal.

Mr. COLLINS. I do not see any use of spending any further time on this bill.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GREENWOOD]?

There was no objection.

DIVISION OF SAFETY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 995) to create in the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor a division of safety.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, I have raised some question heretofore about the attitude of the Budget on this bill. I have also suggested that there is plenty of law now authorizing the appropriations that this bill proposes to authorize.

I have a copy of a letter written by the Director of the Budget to the chairman of the Committee on Labor, June 21, 1930, which seems to me to entirely corroborate my views on that subject. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to revise and extend my remarks by inserting this letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

JUNE 21, 1930.

Hon. W. F. KOPP,

Chairman Committee on Labor,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. KOPP: I received your letter of June 19 the following day, and as the bill, H. R. 995, concerning which you wrote, had not been referred to the Bureau of the Budget for comment I was not familiar with its provisions and had to do some investigating in order to familiarize myself with the situation.

I find that the organic law under which the Bureau of Labor Statistics now operates (U. S. C., title 29, sec. 1), is sufficiently broad to cover the objects and activities covered by the bill H. R. 995, as evidenced by the collection and publication of statistics of industrial accidents in the United States by that bureau, the latest publication of this nature, Bulletin No. 490 of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, having been issued in August, 1929.

It would appear, therefore, that the enactment of further legislation such as H. R. 995 is not necessary to accomplish the purposes of that bill, and it would seem that the setting up of a separate division of safety with a chief of division and an assistant chief would unnecessarily increase the administrative overhead.

As you are no doubt aware, investigations and reports on accidents and demonstrations of safety measures are now being conducted by the Bureau of Mines and by the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is probable that other bureaus and departments are also actively interested in work of this character, and I feel that a careful examination should be made before setting up an additional activity which might duplicate the work of existing activities.

I will be glad to look into this matter, which had not previously been brought to my attention, and give consideration to such estimates as the Department of Labor may submit for inclusion in the Budget with a view to carrying on the work of this nature which is not a duplication of that carried on by other activities.

Very truly yours,

J. CLAWSON ROOP,
Director of the Budget.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of that letter, and in order that it may have the consideration of my colleague from Indiana, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] will not insist on his objection to the immediate consideration of this legislation. The Secretary of Labor [Mr. Doak] says that the benefits of the bill will be an hundredfold of the cost. The Budget serves a useful purpose most of the time, but the American people elected Congress to legislate for them. My notion of the matter is that Mr. Doak knows somewhat more of the need of this safety measure than does the Budget. The Secretary is an able executive and has been in close contact with working people all of his life. More than 20,000 men are killed outright in industry each year. More than 200,000 are permanently injured. The object of this bill is to reduce this terrible and unnecessary loss and suffering. To save the life of an American workman is, in my opinion, worth more than the value of all the opinions that the Budget can write. This legislation is not a question of a small expense. It is a question of reducing the loss of life of American workmen. Secretary DAVIS indorsed this measure and Secretary Doak asks for its enactment.

MICHAUD DIVISION OF FORT HALL INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10880) authorizing the construction of the Michaud division of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and appropriation therefor, and the completion of the project, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

WIDENING WISCONSIN AVENUE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 3895) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to widen Wisconsin Avenue abutting squares 1299, 1300, and 1935.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized to institute in the

Supreme Court of the District of Columbia proceedings in rem to condemn for the widening of Wisconsin Avenue part of lot 309, square 1300, containing 2,285.1 square feet; part of lot 261, square 1299, containing 1,585.25 square feet; and parts of lots 2 and 3, square 1935, containing 207.56 square feet, as shown on map No. 1476, filed in the office of the surveyor of the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That said condemnation proceedings shall be instituted under the provisions of subchapter 1 of Chapter XV of the Code of Law of the District of Columbia and under the provisions of Public Act No. 311, Sixty-ninth Congress, approved May 28, 1926, said condemnation proceedings to be subject to any and all provisions applicable to the condemnation of streets as laid down in the plan of the permanent system of highways for the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENROLLMENT OF INDIANS OF KLAMATH INDIAN RESERVATION, OREG.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 3156) providing for the final enrollment of the Indians of the Klamath Indian Reservation in the State of Oregon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, this is a very important bill. It has an adverse report from the department. It seems to me this is a very good bill for the committee to call up on Calendar Wednesday. The Committee on Indian Affairs has the call week after next. I suggest this go over until that time.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

UINTAH, WHITE RIVER, AND UNCOMPAGRE BANDS OF UTE INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 615) authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Uintah, White River, and Uncompahgre Bands of Ute Indians in the State of Utah for certain lands, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, for the reason as stated on the preceding bill, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, if I may reserve that request, I should correct my statement. As to this bill there is no adverse report from the bureau. There is no report whatever from the bureau on a bill involving between one and two million dollars. I think before it comes up on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, on Calendar Wednesday, or in any other way we ought to have an explicit report from the bureau upon the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. This bill once passed both Houses, and was pocket-vetted by the President.

Mr. COLTON. No, no. Not this bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. It has had quite a strenuous career.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was pocketed by the President.

Mr. COLTON. This bill has been before Congress in several forms for several years. It was originally a bill referring the matter to the Court of Claims. It is now a perfectly plain proposition. The Government took a million acres of Indian lands and put them in a forest reserve, and this simply provides for payment for that land at the minimum rate of \$1.25 an acre.

Mr. CRAMTON. This is a bill on which my mind is somewhat open. The report of the committee has not satisfied me as to all the facts. For instance, I am not clear in my mind as to whether these Indians ever had title to these lands. If there was title given to a part of them by the original order, how does it happen that some other Indians could be moved in and given half of the lands? I think

this is a bill that ought to have a definite, responsible statement from the department in charge other than just a memorandum reciting certain facts.

Mr. GREENWOOD. As I understand, this bill has heretofore passed both Houses of Congress and those matters were fully looked in heretofore.

Mr. COLTON. That is correct as to a former bill. This bill in its present form was not passed.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I have studied the bill some, and I think it has great merit, and inasmuch as it has been so long and has passed both Houses, I think the bill ought to be passed.

Mr. CRAMTON. What I am suggesting now is that it be deferred until a week from Wednesday, when this committee will have Calendar Wednesday, and I suggest that at that time they present a definite report from the Interior Department.

Mr. COLTON. If there is any question about the title, it involves the title to lands in the entire former Uintah Reservation. That has been passed on time and time again.

Mr. GREENWOOD. As I understand, this represents a surplussage of lands that were taken under a treaty, to be paid for at so much per acre, and after it was surveyed it was found out that this surplus existed, and they have never been able to collect for that surplus.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is not the question involved here. The case the gentleman is speaking about was a South Dakota case, and in that case they got their money.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask if it is not a fact that the President of the United States, as the head of the present administration, refused to sign this bill and made a pocket veto of it, which was, in effect, giving his disapproval and the disapproval of the administration to this bill.

Mr. COLTON. The gentleman is in error. The bill to which the gentleman refers would have sent the matter to the Court of Claims. It involved also other lands than those embraced in the present bill.

Mr. BLANTON. But it was practically the same legislation.

Mr. COLTON. No. That was not signed because the calendar of the Court of Claims was crowded, and the merits of the bill were not taken into consideration.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman acquaint the House as to the reason why this bill has not been referred to the Department of the Interior for comment?

Mr. COLTON. The chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee is present and can give that information. I can not, because I am not a member of the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Until this case gets the approval of the department I am going to object.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit, I asked unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BLANTON. I will withdraw the objection if that is carried out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REDEMPTION OF INTERNAL-REVENUE STAMPS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10658) to amend section 1 of the act of May 12, 1900 (ch. 393, 31 Stat. 177), as amended (U. S. C., sec. 1174, ch. 21, title 26).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I still believe this bill is ill advised. I have taken it up with the Treasury Department and they are in favor of the bill. However, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that this bill not only adds a new medium for the return of taxes paid and covered into the Treasury but it also takes away the statute of limitations on these unused stamps provided for in the act of May 12, 1900. What you

are going to do is to open the door for a refund of these tobacco taxes at any time after they have been paid, and by doing that you make it difficult to accurately estimate the revenue from that source.

Mr. JENKINS. Will it not also open this door, and cause the tobacco dealers to be so careless in the preparation of their products for sale that they will put a great additional burden upon the Government departments, for they will know that they will be recompensed for their stamp outlay?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. It seems to me the tax we provide for tobacco is a manufacturer's tax and not a sales tax. If it is a manufacturer's tax, it seems to me that when once imposed there should be no refund. However, they claim that when they change a grade or standard or when they change a wrapper and find that their cigars or other articles are not marketable, they should be permitted to obtain a refund of the taxes paid as evidenced by the stamps on the wrappers. The only provision we now have for a refund of this tax is when the tobacco is exported. They say that in many instances these export sales are of inferior quality, but it seems to me that if they have tried it on the American market and it does not go that is their lookout and their loss. I am not going to object to it because the department says they want it, and the gentleman from Kentucky, who is always very zealous in these matters and knows conditions, tells me it is very urgent, but I say it is ill advised.

Mr. JENKINS. What does the gentleman from Kentucky have to say in favor of this bill?

Mr. THATCHER. Here is the situation: The manufactured products of tobacco which go to jobbers and dealers through sale, in many instances are destroyed or damaged, and the existing law and regulations are not broad enough in their provisions to permit of a refund of taxes. When such tobaccos have been entirely destroyed and are of no use as far as their consumable quality is concerned, the taxes are lost absolutely, and if they are damaged, the only way in the world that a manufacturer or a jobber can secure any refund of taxes thereon would be under the export provisions of the law, which permits a refund in case of export.

The practical effect has been that a great many manufactured tobacco products which have been damaged have been exported because that was the only way to get a refund of stamp taxes, the result being that such tobacco products exported into foreign countries have received more or less of a bad name because of their defective quality.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman answer this question? Will the department provide such regulations with respect to the return of this money—

Mr. THATCHER. The act so provides and the proposed law was drawn in collaboration with the tobacco tax division and the other Treasury authorities, in order to have it properly safeguarded. They believe this is a proper bill to give effect to the remedy proposed, and they also state that the net loss of revenue to the Government will be very small, because when goods are withdrawn then new goods will be manufactured and put in their place and new stamps will be affixed. So there will be no substantial loss to the Government, and this will increase the sale of tobacco from the farms to the factories.

Mr. JENKINS. What does the gentleman say about this statement? What control will they have over a tobacco manufacturer who, after he has manufactured his tobacco and put the stamp on it, seeks by way of some subterfuge to have that stamp canceled for his own personal benefit, when the tobacco is not damaged?

Mr. THATCHER. The proposed act provides that the Treasury Department shall formulate and enforce the proper regulations to safeguard it and we can trust the Treasury Department to safeguard the matter.

Mr. JENKINS. That is just the question I have asked. Has the gentleman studied the regulations so that he can say that the regulations will be effective?

Mr. THATCHER. The Treasury Department may be trusted to frame the regulations so as to protect the reve-

nues, and this measure is recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. JENKINS. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am not going to object, but I simply serve notice now that the time will not be very long before we will have a lot of trouble by reason of this bill, if it passes, and it will come back to haunt us.

Mr. THATCHER. I thank my colleagues for withdrawing their objections. As a practical matter, the operation of this measure, if enacted into law, will prove very beneficial to the manufacturers and dealers in tobacco products, as well as to tobacco producers, yet no hardship will be wrought upon the Treasury. The bill simply amends and broadens existing law providing for the redemption of tax stamps affixed to articles to denote the payment of internal-revenue taxes. Under leave, I am including as a part of these remarks the reports of the House Ways and Means Committee on this bill. The measure was fully considered by that committee, and a favorable report was made thereon. Also, it was fully considered by the Treasury Department officials, especially those of the tobacco tax division. Not only did these officials approve the purpose of the bill but they also aided and cooperated in drafting it. They knew that its purpose was just and equitable, and they knew, in addition, how its provisions should be formulated so as to accord justice to the tobacco trade, and at the same time give full protection to the Treasury Department.

At the instance of tobacco manufacturers and dealers, I introduced this bill on the 12th of last March. The Secretary of the Treasury on April 22, 1930, made to the Ways and Means Committee, under reference, a favorable report thereon. That report is included with the original report of the Ways and Means Committee filed on June 20, 1930, favoring the passage of the bill. A few days ago I again conferred with Treasury officials concerning the provisions of the bill to ascertain if, upon further consideration, they had any changes or modifications to suggest. I was again assured that the measure, with inclusion of the simple amendment suggested by the Secretary of the Treasury, and reported by the committee, represented the views of the Treasury Department on the subject, and that they favored the enactment of the bill in this form.

Under the regulations which the Treasury Department will promulgate, if the measure is enacted, it is understood that tax-paid tobacco products in the hands of jobbers and dealers, when damaged or rendered unsalable, may become the subject of these refunds, as well as similar products in the actual hands of manufacturers and importers. However, it is expected that the jobbers and dealers will make, with the manufacturers and importers, satisfactory arrangements whereby the Treasury Department may deal with these refunds through the manufacturers and importers. All this is a matter of departmental detail, and the officials of the Treasury Department will desire to frame and to carry into effect regulations which will be reasonable and workable.

Tobacco products, after being tax-paid, may be injured through fire or water, through shipment and transportation, and also through other causes. In addition, as pointed out by Secretary Mellon, certain brands on the market may become deteriorated, and the manufacturers may desire to replace the same with fresh and marketable articles. Such replacement would mean the sale of more tobacco by the producer to the manufacturer and the utilization of more labor in manufacturing the new goods, and in placing them in the hands of the dealer. New tax stamps will be required and there will be no appreciable loss of internal revenue taxes.

In brief, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, permit me to say that the justice of this measure seems to be so obvious that a statement of its purpose should suffice.

The reports of the Ways and Means Committee on the bill are as follows:

[House of Representatives, Report No. 1995, Seventy-first Congress, second session]

REDEMPTION OF INTERNAL-REVENUE STAMPS

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted the following report (to accompany H. R. 10658):

The Committee on Ways and Means, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10658) to amend section 1 of the act of May 12, 1900 (ch. 393, 31 Stat. 177), as amended (U. S. C., sec. 1174; ch. 21, title 26), having had the same under consideration, report it back to the House with an amendment and recommend that as amended the bill do pass.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, line 7, after the word "stamps," insert "irrespective of the date of their purchase."

The proposed legislation amends existing law to permit manufacturers, under proper regulations to be prescribed by the Treasury Department, to recover the value of internal-revenue stamps affixed to tobacco manufactures which have been removed from the place of manufacture for consumption or sale but which the owner has been unable to market, or which may have become damaged or stale, or otherwise unmerchantable through failure of a new brand to sell, by reason of faulty or unattractive packages, or for other legitimate reasons. Some manufacturers also protect their brands by frequently replacing those on the market with fresh goods.

Under existing law a manufacturer who withdraws such product from the market must lose the value of the stamp or stamps affixed thereto unless he exports the product and obtains a drawback of the tax paid. It is estimated that 94 per cent of the drawback paid on tobacco manufactures during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1929, represented tobacco withdrawn and exported for the purpose of recovering the value of the stamps affixed.

To require the manufacturers to export damaged or defective tobacco products in order to secure refund of the stamp taxes paid thereon not only subjects the manufacturers to substantial inconvenience and loss but also results in dumping into foreign markets unsatisfactory American manufactures with the consequence that American-made goods suffer in reputation in foreign countries. One of the purposes of this measure is to obviate this situation.

It is estimated that claims presented under this bill will amount to about \$450,000 based upon the current rate of tax collections, but will be nearly offset by increased receipts from the sale of stamps to manufacturers on goods that replace the products so removed from the market.

The purpose of the amendment is to make it clear that the 4-year statute of limitation applicable to unused stamps contained in the act of May 12, 1900, will not apply in the case of redemption of stamps on goods withdrawn from the market and was suggested by the Treasury Department.

The bill has the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, as set forth in the following letter under date of April 2, 1930:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 22, 1930.

Hon. WILLIS C. HAWLEY,
Chairman Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of March 19, 1930, inclosing a copy of H. R. 10658, by Mr. THATCHER, a bill to amend section 1 of the act of May 12, 1900, as amended, relating to redemption of certain internal-revenue stamps, and stating that the committee would be glad to receive any comments or recommendations that the department may care to make thereon.

The act of May 12, 1900, as amended, authorizes the Commissioner of Internal Revenue under certain conditions to redeem internal-revenue stamps, but that authority has been construed in Regulations 8, revised April, 1928, article 116, and prior revisions of said regulations, "not to include stamps that have been regularly and properly used by a manufacturer in payment of tax on his tobacco product and which was removed from the place of manufacture for consumption or sale. The fact that such goods become damaged, stale, or unmerchantable after they have been stamped, denoting payment of tax, and have been removed from the place of manufacture, will not entitle the owner to a refund of the tax." It is understood that some manufacturers protect their brands on the market by replacing that which has deteriorated with fresh goods. There are other reasons why a manufacturer might wish to withdraw his product from the market; for example, failure of a new brand to sell, faulty or unattractive packages, etc.

A manufacturer who withdraws his product from the market must lose the value of the stamp or stamps affixed thereto unless, having found a foreign purchaser for such product, he exports the same with benefit of drawback of the internal-revenue tax paid thereon under the provisions of section 3386 of the Revised Statutes and regulations (at present No. 73) promulgated pursuant thereto. Drawback of tax paid on tobacco manufactures exported during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1929, amounted to \$141,484.71. A large part of such allowance of drawback, or approximately 94 per cent, represents tax-paid tobacco manufactures which the principal manufacturers in the United States withdrew from the market and exported in order to recover the value of the stamps affixed.

H. R. 10658 will enable manufacturers to recover the value of stamps affixed to tobacco manufactures which they withdraw from the market without going to the trouble and expense of exporting tax-paid tobacco manufactures and claiming drawback of the tax paid thereon. Importers would be accorded the same privilege, although they are not entitled under section 3386, Revised Statutes, to drawback of tax paid on imported manufactures exported. The redemption of unused internal-revenue stamps for tobacco manufactures, which amounted to \$314,399.68 during the fiscal year 1929, will not be affected by the proposed act. Allowance of drawback of taxes on tobacco manufactures exported will be re-

duced to the extent that manufacturers who theretofore claimed drawback, avail themselves of the privilege of redemption of stamps under the proposed legislation. It is estimated that claims presented under the proposed act will approximate one-tenth of 1 per cent of the tobacco tax collections, amounting to about \$450,000, based on the current rate of collections. Increased receipts from the sale of stamps to manufacturers will result from tax payment of product removed from factories for replacement of goods withdrawn from the market, and nearly offset the redemptions.

The department recommends amendment of H. R. 10658 by adding at the close thereof the words, "irrespective of the date of their purchase," in order to make it clear that the 4-year statute of limitations applicable to unused stamps contained in the act of May 12, 1900, would not apply in the case of redemption of stamps on goods withdrawn from the market. It would be practically impossible to determine whether or not stamps affixed to tobacco products of domestic manufacture withdrawn from the market were purchased within the statute of limitations of four years from date of filing claim for their redemption, other than approximately in those cases where the manufacturers canceled the stamps. The dates of cancellation of stamps afford the only practical means of applying any statute of limitations in respect to redemption of stamps under the proposed legislation. With the change suggested, the department is disposed to recommend favorable consideration of the bill in question.

Very truly yours,

A. W. MELLON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

[House of Representatives, Report No. 1995, part 2, Seventy-first Congress, second session]

REDEMPTION OF INTERNAL-REVENUE STAMPS

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted the following supplemental report (to accompany H. R. 10658):

The Committee on Ways and Means, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10658) to amend section 1 of the act of May 12, 1900 (ch. 393, 31 Stat. 177), as amended (U. S. C., sec. 1174; ch. 21, title 26), submits the following supplemental report:

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 2a of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows: Existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman; new matter is printed in italic:

That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, subject to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, may, upon receipt of satisfactory evidence of the facts, make allowance for or redeem such of the stamps, issued under authority of law, to denote the payment of any internal-revenue tax, as may have been spoiled, destroyed, or rendered useless or unfit for the purpose intended, or for which the owner may have no use, or which through mistake may have been improperly or unnecessarily used, or where the rates or duties represented thereby have been excessive in amount, paid in error, or in any manner wrongfully collected. Such allowance or redemption may be made, either by giving other stamps in lieu of the stamps so allowed for or redeemed, or by refunding the amount or value to the owner thereof, deducting therefrom, in case of repayment, the percentage, if any allowed to the purchaser thereof; but no allowance or redemption shall be made in any case until the stamps so spoiled or rendered useless shall have been returned to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, or until satisfactory proof has been made showing the reason why the same can not be returned; or, if so required by the said commissioner, when the person presenting the same can not satisfactorily trace the history of said stamps from their issuance to the presentation of his claim as aforesaid: *Provided*, That documentary and proprietary stamps issued under the provisions of "An act to provide ways and means for war expenditures, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1898, may be redeemed only when presented in quantities of \$2 or more, face value: *Provided further*, That no claim for the redemption of or allowance for stamps shall be allowed unless presented within four years after the purchase of such stamps from the Government: *And provided further*, That internal-revenue stamps affixed to packages of tobacco, snuff, cigars, or cigarettes which, after removal from factory or customhouse for consumption or sale, the manufacturer or importer withdraws from the market, may, under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, be redeemed if claim therefor is presented by the manufacturer or importer, within two years from the dates of cancellation of said stamps irrespective of the date of their purchase.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to redeem or make allowance for internal-revenue stamps," approved May 12, 1900 (ch. 393, 31 Stats. 177), as amended (U. S. C., sec. 1174, ch. 21, title 26), be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding at the close thereof the following: "*And provided further*, That internal-revenue stamps affixed to packages of tobacco, snuff, cigars, or cigarettes which, after removal from factory or customhouse for consumption or sale, the manufacturer or importer withdraws from the market, may, under regulations prescribed by the Com-

missioner of Internal Revenue with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, be redeemed if claim therefor is presented by the manufacturer or importer, within two years from the dates of cancellation of said stamps."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 9, after the word "stamps," insert "irrespective of the date of their purchase."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALARY OF THE SECRETARY OF ALASKA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11368) to fix the annual compensation of the secretary of the Territory of Alaska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder what has become of the bill proposing an increase in salary for the Governor of Alaska. When that bill was reached on the calendar it was objected to by the Delegate from Alaska. If there is any place in the Government service where a \$10,000 man is needed, it is as Governor of Alaska. So far as I know, the present governor is a very able man, and if he is not we ought to have an able man there, because the problems of development of Alaska are very important. Notwithstanding this fact the Delegate from Alaska objected to an increase of salary for the governor, who has these heavy responsibilities, but when it comes to the secretary, whose duties are, I will not say clerical, but not as onerous as those of the governor, we are all strongly for an increase of salary for that secretary. It seems to me we ought to defer consideration of this until we find out what has become of the bill giving the governor an increase of salary.

Mr. MAAS. If the gentleman will withhold his objection, I quite understand the gentleman's point of view in regard to the desirability or necessity of raising the governor's salary, but I can not see that that affects the question of raising the secretary's salary. If the secretary's salary ought to be raised, it ought to be raised independently of whether the governor's salary is raised or not.

Mr. CRAMTON. Perhaps we might put it in this way. Personally I do not believe there is any occasion for raising the salary of the secretary of Alaska, but if there is to be a salary-raising program and the officer who has the greatest opportunity for service and the greatest responsibility is cared for, I will not insist on my views as to the secretary, but the Delegate from Alaska is the one who stopped the increase for the governor.

Mr. MAAS. Let me explain to the gentleman that I can well understand his position, and I think his objection is very logical in view of the unfortunate circumstance that the hearings before the committee were not printed. I can see perfectly how the gentleman, without all the facts before him, would view the situation in this light, but I have a transcript of the testimony here, and I would like to call one or two things to the attention of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAMTON. May I suggest to the gentleman that I would not be able to withhold objection to-day. I think the bill for the governor ought to be put back on the calendar and run the gauntlet along with this.

Mr. MAAS. If the gentleman from Michigan will bear with me just a moment, the question of the Governor's salary is a question of raising his salary, but in the matter of the secretary, his salary has actually been reduced. The facts are that the secretary of Alaska is not getting the salary that the secretary has always been getting heretofore, due to a court decision.

Mr. JENKINS. What was the salary before?

Mr. MAAS. The salary previously was \$4,400. It was a combined salary, because he received one salary from the Territory of Alaska and one from the Federal Government for the two functions that he performed.

Mr. CRAMTON. What was that combined salary?

Mr. MAAS. I think it was \$4,400.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does the gentleman mean to say that the secretary of Alaska is not getting more than \$4,400?

Mr. MAAS. The Secretary of Alaska, at the present time, is getting \$3,600. The secretary of Alaska has actually had his salary reduced and the department itself, when the administrative assistant to the Secretary of the Interior came before the committee, said:

I will say this, that the department, a number of times, has tried to get this salary raised, but we have been unsuccessful because there is no substantive law for it.

Mr. CRAMTON. But the gentleman is not trying to bring him up to \$4,400 where he was before. The bill proposes to bring him up to \$5,800 and that is based on the plea they want to give him the same salary that the secretary of Hawaii receives.

Now the secretary of Hawaii has a statute salary of \$5,400. So the bill seeks to put the secretary of Alaska \$400 above the statutory salary of the secretary of Hawaii. The Delegate from Alaska, who ought to be particularly well informed on these things, proposed putting the salary of the secretary of Alaska at the same standard as the secretary of Hawaii, when he objected to the salary of the governor being put on the same plane as that of the Governor of Hawaii. If the gentleman wants to put the salary at \$4,400 I shall not object.

Mr. MAAS. While we are making the salary a statutory salary we ought to give a fair and reasonable salary. I would be glad to accept that amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. Would the gentleman apply that to the salary of the Governor of Alaska—

Mr. MAAS. I am not objecting to that, but I do not think we ought to hold up the salary of the secretary on that account, for I do not think they are related.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for three minutes on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I feel that an explanation is due to the House for the statements that have been made repeatedly by the gentleman from Michigan that I objected to an increase of the salary for the Governor of Alaska. I would like to give my reason. For the past three years I have been aware of the fact that the secretary of Alaska was underpaid. He has been receiving a salary of \$3,600, which is not commensurate with the amount of work he does. I tried to get the Committee on Appropriations to increase it, and the Secretary of the Interior recommended it, but it was held that it would be illegal to do so without an act of authorization.

Now, the bill of the gentleman from Minnesota for an increase of salary of the secretary has been before the House for a long time and no action has been taken by the committee. A bill was introduced in the Senate to increase the salary of the Governor of Alaska to \$10,000. It passed promptly after the committee reported it. It was considered by the committee of the House before it was officially before the committee. They did not have the bill before them when they approved of the Senate bill.

Realizing that that had not been done in accordance with the rules of the House, they had to call a second meeting and they approved of their action of two days before.

My opposition was to this haste. It was unjustifiable increasing a high-bracket salary when a measure to increase the salary of the low-bracket employee had been steadily set aside during this period of Congress.

I still maintain that the salary of the Governor of Alaska to-day, at \$7,000, is fair and equitable. The salary of the secretary of Alaska is not fair and reasonable. I do not presume to say that this bill contains the right figure, nor have I submitted a figure that he is entitled to, but he is entitled to a higher salary than he is now getting. The governor is in the high brackets, and I maintain that this is no time, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] says, to increase the salaries in the high brackets.

In general I question the wisdom of raising them in the low brackets.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman be agreeable to passing the bill at \$4,400, so that the salary of the secretary would not be decreased?

Mr. MAAS. If you put it at \$5,000, I will agree.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think, Mr. Speaker, this can be worked out, and I renew my motion that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. That has already been agreed to.

MINIMUM AGE LIMIT FOR THE NAVAL RESERVE OR MARINE CORPS RESERVE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6145) to regulate the minimum age limit for enlistments in the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12918) to amend the national defense act of June 3, 1916, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a very long and comprehensive bill. I am sure that the House wants to hear a justification and a reason for the changes made in it. While not expressing myself at this time upon the merits of the bill, I do not believe that a bill of 26 pages should be considered on this calendar.

Mr. SPEAKS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is supported by the National Guard and all of the volunteer forces of the United States. The bill has been very thoroughly considered by the National Guard and reserve forces over a period of years, and its sole purpose is to increase the effectiveness of the national defense system. No appropriation is required to make it operative. Many Members are interested in having it taken up at this time. However, a few gentlemen feel that it should not be considered under consent procedure, and I therefore request that it go over without prejudice.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, if the gentleman wants the bill passed, as our distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. SPEAKS] is going to leave us at the close of this session, why does not the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] permit it to be passed at this time? It seems to be a good bill, and the National Guard all over the United States wants it.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I know that. I have a telegram right here from the adjutant general of my State urging the passage of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. There will be no other opportunity to pass the bill.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Oh, he can get it under suspension, or he may get a rule.

Mr. BLANTON. I doubt whether he would ever get suspension on this bill.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I do not think it ought to be passed on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. BLANTON. If it is a good bill and everybody understands it, why not pass it now as we pass other bills?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I think it ought to be debated.

Mr. GREENWOOD. This is a very comprehensive bill, and it ought not to be passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. SPEAKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SALARY OF SECRETARY OF ALASKA

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to No. 769 on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 11368, to fix the annual compensation of the secretary of the Territory of Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this bill?

Mr. MAAS. This bill was up a few moments ago, and I think we have reached an agreement about it.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I do not think we ought to begin that practice. There are other bills on the calendar that ought to be considered, and I shall have to object.

Mr. MAAS. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. COLLINS. No; I object.

FEDERAL BUILDING PROGRAM

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14040) to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to expedite work on the Federal building program authorized by the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926, and acts amendatory thereof.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I point out as I did before that this bill not only gives the Secretary of the Treasury discretion as to who shall receive the awards or contracts, but would even give him the discretion as to who would be permitted to bid on contracts.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. That is the same objection that we had up the other day, and I understand that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT], has an amendment that he will propose.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I took this matter up in the committee, and the committee has agreed on an amendment to the bill on page 2, line 7, after the word "buildings" to strike out the remainder of the line, all of lines 8, 9, and 10 and the last syllable of the word "require" beginning on line 11, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

To limit the issuance of plans and specifications for said work to such applicants as are financially and technically qualified, and have the necessary equipment, organization, and practical experience and have satisfactorily completed former work within the contract time stipulated therefor.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Who suggested that amendment?

Mr. ELLIOTT. This amendment was worked out in the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Then I submit that it is treating the Members who objected to this bill with very little consideration, because it is exactly the provision of the bill now.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Oh, it is not.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman surely must believe that we can understand a bill. He will never get by with anything like that.

Mr. ELLIOTT. It is not a question of "getting by" with anything. We are trying to do something that will inure to the benefit of the people of this country in the progress of this public building program.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I think the department is trying to favor certain contractors, and I say to the gentleman from Indiana that certain contractors doing business with the Treasury Department are favored to the extent that they are not required to give bond.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The department did not draw this amendment. Several of the members of the Committee on Public

Buildings and Grounds had a hand in it, and I think that it was finally drafted by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], the ranking minority member of that committee.

Mr. LANHAM rose.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I say to the gentleman that there is no difference except in phraseology as to the intent and purpose and effect of the proposed amendment from the provisions of the original bill.

Mr. LANHAM. I think there is a very material difference. This particular amendment was drafted by a subcommittee appointed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. Exception was taken in the committee to the provision now in the bill, that it would give discretionary authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to limit bids to an individual. The object of this amendment is to limit it only to a class, that class being the contractors who are qualified to do the work.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Who have previously satisfactorily performed contracts for the department?

Mr. LANHAM. No.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Well, that is in the amendment.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman agree to the amendment if the gentleman from Indiana will insert the word "or" instead of the word "and" after the words "practical experience"?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. No.

Mr. LANHAM. I think if the gentleman from New York will read the amendment a little more carefully he will see that it does not support the inference he has made.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The proposed amendment, as read by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT], says that specifications and plans shall be refused to persons who do not come up to certain requirements. Let the bidding be open and then give to the Secretary discretion, if you please, to award contracts to people who come up to certain requirements, but, do not shut off the bidding.

Mr. LANHAM. In response to that, may I say that the committee was advised that the Secretary of the Treasury now has authority to do this very thing, subsequent to the submission of the bids?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. That is all right.

Mr. LANHAM. What this bill is designed to do is to expedite construction to try to relieve unemployment on the projects that we now have in hand, and to eliminate in advance those bids which could not be acceptable, rather than eliminate them afterwards, but not to restrict competition among those who are qualified to carry on the work.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the gentleman absolutely accurate when he says that this amendment virtually is coextensive with existing practice? I direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that under the proposed amendment a bidder who has not heretofore ever engaged in Government work will be privileged to enter into contracts for new work. Certainly we do not want to go to the extreme of creating a monopoly for only those who have heretofore done Government work. In my own city of Milwaukee there are responsible building contractors who may never have done Government work but who have done private work involving hundreds of thousands of dollars, and who are qualified to undertake Government work. The last clause of the amendment reads, "And has satisfactorily completed former work within the contract time stipulated therefor."

Mr. LANHAM. That does not say "former work for the United States Government" and I do not think the amendment justifies the inference which the gentleman has made.

Mr. STAFFORD. What does it mean then "and have satisfactorily completed former work within the contract time stipulated therefor?"

Mr. JENKINS. To be sure, it does not mean "former work for the United States Government."

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the Secretary of the Treasury going to investigate every instance of a contractor who may have had a good excuse for not completing his work within the

contract time? He would be barred under the phraseology referred to.

Mr. LANHAM. I concede it is highly expedient, from the standpoint of promoting our governmental construction, that men who are habitually months, and in some cases a year or more, behind time in the construction of their buildings, should not be given contracts. Awarding work to such men would hamper materially the governmental construction.

Mr. STAFFORD. But under the existing practice you do not have to grant a contract to that character of contractor.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. But you are shutting off the opportunity to bid.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. It takes four months to get a plan approved on a building costing \$125,000.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. That is because the department is stubborn in not going out and employing additional necessary architects.

Mr. GREEN. Certainly; and they want people employed, and still it takes four months to get the plans approved.

Mr. JENKINS. Is not this the reason for this bill, that there are a lot of men who want to bid on the Government jobs who are absolutely disqualified and incompetent people? They are small builders in other words, but they come in and ask for a great set of plans, and it has simply swamped the Government to furnish plans. They have to furnish hundreds of plans to people who are absolutely disqualified and unfit to do the work, but can the gentleman see that there is any way by which any amendment adopted here will relieve the situation without stifling the right of free bidding? I can not see that you can amend the bill so that you will not stifle free bidding. If it can be done, I am in favor of it.

Mr. LANHAM. I do not think this stifles the right of free bidding. For instance, we have stricken out in the committee section 2 of this bill, covering the very thing which the gentleman has spoken about.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the regular order.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADDRESS BY HON. CARL G. BACHMAN, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. EVANS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a 15-minute speech made by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BACHMANN] a few evenings ago on the subject of communism.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVANS of California. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Representative CARL G. BACHMANN, of West Virginia, during the program "Fifteen Minutes in the Nation's Capitol," made over a National Broadcasting Co. network, Monday night, January 12.

COMMUNISM

I appreciate this opportunity to speak over this coast-to-coast network, through courtesy of the National Broadcasting Co., on a subject which is of great importance at this particular time.

As a member of the special committee of the House of Representatives appointed to investigate activities of communists in the United States, I am firmly convinced that the movement is far more extensively organized than is generally believed by the American people.

Thousands of our citizens are now becoming aware of the new kind of warfare communists are waging against the Government of the United States. While many remain ignorant of and indifferent to what is actually taking place in this connection, nevertheless, to those who know, communism, unless exterminated, may eventually become a serious menace to our republican form of government.

I am not an alarmist, and do not anticipate there is danger of an immediate revolutionary uprising from the communists, but I believe that the Federal Government should take precautionary

measures to guard against this alien revolutionary conspiracy, aimed at the heart of our Government and at the life, liberty, and happiness of our people.

What the communists do in Russia is their business, but when they plan to overthrow the Government of the United States and substitute therefor a soviet form of government that is our business. No movement which strikes at the foundation of government, home, the family, and religion should ever be permitted to flourish within the boundaries of the United States.

Communism is an organized effort to overthrow organized governments. Its objectives are the abolition of government, property rights, religion, and family relations.

Communism in the United States is directly controlled by the Communist International in Russia through the Communist Party of the United States. From Moscow as a center, the Communist International which might be spoken of as an international revolutionary party, seeks to spread the doctrine that the whole world is divided into two camps, that of capitalism and that of socialism. The Communist International aims to destroy capitalism.

The aim of the Communist Party is the creation of a "communist society." The final and ultimate end is "anarchy." The method by which the communists seek to accomplish this end in the United States is by the forcible, violent, armed overthrow of the Government; civil war, revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and finally by the erection of the socialist soviet republic of the United States, which would become a unit or part of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. The whole program is all skillfully planned, timed, and executed. The propaganda is ceaseless, and the activities unyielding and insidious. There is no thought of fair dealing, justice, or humanity. The sole objective is a revolution by the proletariat. No other consideration enters into it; no mercy, no reason—nothing but class hatred and the soviet union.

The usual communist defense, when brought into court and the legality of their organization questioned, is that the Communist Party is a political party; that it nominates and votes for candidates for office; that it has been on the ballot in many States. This, of course, is camouflage and evasion. Their official literature and the utterances of their leaders all stress the fact that they do not believe in the use of the ballot and that their aims can only be attained through violent armed methods, revolution, and dictatorship, while organized in a special political party. Personally, I feel there is abundance of evidence and ample justification to declare the Communist Party or any other like organization seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence, to be illegal. In other words, any party seeking through revolutionary means to supplant the American flag with the red flag, and the substitution of a government by soviets for the American Government, should be outlawed.

Prior to 1924 the Communist Party was driven underground through the activities of the Department of Justice, which, at that time, under the provisions of war-time legislation, handled the problem. With the repeal of war-time legislation about 1924 and the consequent halting of Government activities through the Department of Justice, the communists came more and more into the open, and since that time they have been a police problem. An organization such as the Communist Party can not grow, expand, or successfully function underground, and during the period that the Government was active through the Department of Justice the movement remained comparatively stationary.

I believe that appropriate legislation should be immediately enacted by the Congress enlarging the powers of the Department of Justice so there will be at least one branch of the Federal Government in constant touch with what is taking place, and that additional appropriations should be provided for the purpose of employing sufficiently skilled agents in the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice who can devote their entire time to investigating and preparing reports on activities, propaganda, international ramifications, memberships, and personnel of all entities, groups, or individuals who teach or advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence or who attempt to undermine our republican form of government by inciting riots, sabotage, or revolutionary disorders. The results of such investigations should be furnished to the Congress, to the press, and to the public in general to the end that publicity be turned upon the machinations of such treasonable and seditious groups and the American people fully advised.

The surest and most effective way of combating communism in this country is to give the fullest possible publicity to the fundamental principles and aims of the communists.

The membership of the Communist Party in the United States is largely alien and overwhelmingly foreign born. It is estimated that 75 to 90 per cent of all communists in this country are either aliens or naturalized citizens. Very few native Americans are connected with the movement. Efforts to communize the foreign-born element in our population has met with greater success than any other effort of the communists.

Under our present immigration laws there is nothing excluding a communist. If an alien admits he is a communist he may be admitted as an immigrant. The fact of an alien being a communist is not a bar to entry into the United States. The only way by which a communist may be prevented from entering the United States is for our consular officers to exercise greater care at the point of origin. This, however, in itself is not sufficient, because it is almost impossible for our consular officers to know of the beliefs and affiliations of the many immigrants applying for admission to this country. Our immigration laws should be strengthened so that no communist or any other alien who be-

Heves in the principles of communism would be permitted to enter the United States.

Also our deportation laws should be amended so as to provide for the immediate deportation of all aliens who are members of the Communist Party, or who are in any way connected with the spreading of communist propaganda. If alien communists do not like our form of government, let them go back to their native lands; let them refrain from seeking the overthrow of our Government, or be deported. We have already tolerated their insidious activities and attacks against American institutions too long. We should not permit the Communist Party, or any other party organized by aliens and controlled by an alien government, to adopt and plan to bring into existence a soviet form of government of the United States. No alien or naturalized citizen can be a communist and be loyal to the Government of the United States at the same time. The true communist is a fanatic. He believes thoroughly and completely in the principles of communism. He is not a patriot—America means nothing to him—even though he may be an American citizen. If the communists are ever able to overthrow the Government of the United States, there will be no liberty according to the American conception of liberty. To the contrary, there will be an intolerable dictatorship of communist fanatics, whose policies in turn will be dictated by the communist leaders in Russia. The United States will become a unit of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

Much progress has been made among the youth of the country. The communists attempt to defeat the Americanization of the children of foreign born by the establishment of communist schools throughout the country. The primary purpose of such schools is to teach the principles of communism. Summer camps are also maintained for the children. In 1925 there were two such camps and in 1929 they had increased to 20.

During their attendance at these summer camps the children are educated in the principles and tenets of communism. Anti-patriotic and antireligious instructions are stressed and they are taught hatred and contempt for the American Government, American institutions, and all religions. They are taught to render no respect or allegiance to the American flag—the Stars and Stripes—and it is never displayed.

On the contrary, they are taught to reverence the red flag of communism and world revolution and to formally pledge allegiance to it. Communist schools and communist camps serve no other purpose than to teach the youth of the foreign born to hate the Government of the United States.

The plans and aims of communism are the same the world over. The Russian communist in Moscow and the communist in Berlin, London, New York, and Peking, stand on the same platform and advocate the same principles and all their revolutionary and subversive movements are directed by the executive committee of the Communist International from Moscow.

That communism is on the increase in this country there can be no doubt. In 1924 the communist candidate for President received 36,000 votes. In 1928 W. Z. Foster, the communist candidate for President, received 48,770 votes. It must be remembered that this number represents the votes of American citizens entitled to vote and does not include aliens or migratory workers who could not establish a residence. Nor does it include the number of young people under 21 years of age who are taking an active part in communist activities. The communist ticket was on the ballot in 14 States in 1924 and in 34 States in 1928, a gain of 20 States. This, of course, represents an insignificant percentage of our population, but in this connection it must be remembered that the communists neither expect nor plan to gain control by legal political methods. Their political activities are carried on for publicity and propaganda purposes only.

In 1930 the communist candidates for governors and United States Senators in less than half the States in the Union where they were on the ballot polled approximately 100,000 votes. In New York City alone there were 16,462 votes cast for the communist State ticket. From this alone it can be seen that the movement is gaining strength, and it is my conviction that so long as the Government permits these alien communists to practice their activities in the United States just so long will they continue to increase.

MONUMENT TO WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT AT MANILA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was Senate Joint Resolution 177, to provide for the erection of a monument to William Howard Taft at Manila, P. I.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this resolution provoked some debate on the last consent day, and the chairman of the Committee on the Library did me the honor of submitting certain pictures of monuments and the estimated cost of them. The thought comes to my mind as to whether it is appropriate to erect a monument to the former Governor General of the Philippines, William Howard Taft, or whether it would not be more fitting to erect a memorial. Some years back, when we opened the plaza in front of the Union Station, the Knights of Columbus asked authority to erect a memorial in

honor of the discoverer of America, and they erected a fitting monument, as I think, to the memory of Columbus in the form of a fountain, which, I think, was much more fitting to the memory of the discoverer of America than the monument to Columbus on the concourse in Chicago, on the Michigan Boulevard. The thought occurs to me that as the years go on and we erect only monuments similar to those on the pictures submitted to me by the committee, the generations to come may say, "Who was William Howard Taft?" If we are going to erect anything in memory of this great man, who did so much to start a parliamentary government in the Philippines, why not erect a fitting memorial, not a monument? Then I suggest that we should leave the selection of the site partly to the determination of the Legislature of the Philippine Islands. Some years ago we erected a monument to Archibald Butt on the White House plot. It is enshrouded in shrubbery, and perhaps nobody ever sees it, or, at least, very few. We have monuments erected all about the city, one to Doctor Gross, an eminent surgeon of Philadelphia, and one to General Rawlins, and to many other former celebrities. In the generations to come people visiting Manila might say, "Who was Taft?" A memorial, in the nature of a fountain, might cost \$100,000 or \$200,000, but what of that, in view of the great work Mr. Taft did in starting a free government in the Philippines. So I submit to the chairman of the committee whether it would not be better, instead of merely providing for a monument, to provide for a memorial to be erected on a site to be selected in conjunction with the representatives of the Philippine Legislature.

Mr. GREENWOOD. What is at present proposed?

Mr. STAFFORD. After the discussion of two weeks ago, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Library, presented me with some drawings showing monuments and the amount for which they could be erected. Some of the monuments were estimated to cost \$30,000 or \$35,000. They are in the nature of a tablet with an inscription, something similar to ornate monuments we sometimes see in cemeteries.

I would have the gentleman try to grasp the idea that in the ages to come a fountain would be more typical of the great work Mr. Taft did rather than a mere monument. Take, for instance, the monument erected in honor of General Meade. That is a fitting memorial to the great man who won the Battle of Gettysburg. But such a memorial could not be erected for any \$30,000 or \$50,000. I would say that the monument in the Botanic Garden cost over \$100,000, and I would say that the fountain in honor of Columbus in front of the Union Station, which everyone sees as soon as he enters this great Capital, cost over \$100,000. I do not know, but I do not think I am far wrong in my estimate.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I would like to have the chairman of the committee explain the proposition, because there may be other things which we do not understand.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, there is no difference between the gentleman and myself in this particular. The words "monument" and "memorial" have been used interchangeably in all such legislation, and I think it would be very difficult for me to discriminate between the two. A monument is a memorial and a memorial is more or less monumental. The character of the monument in recognition of the services of Mr. Taft would be within the scope of the judgment of the Fine Arts Commission.

Mr. STAFFORD. Within the limit of the appropriation.

Mr. LUCE. Certainly. So if the gentleman thinks there would be some value in using the word "memorial" I would suggest that the bill be changed by making it read "memorial" instead of "monument." Now, as to the expense.

Mr. STAFFORD. What about my other thought, that the selection of the site should be in conjunction with the Legislature of the Philippine Islands?

Mr. LUCE. I do not know that there would be any objection to that, because that would be the normal thing to do, I should suppose. I presume that was the case in connection with the site for the statue of Henry Clay recently presented to Venezuela. In the ordinary course of things we would

naturally consult the Philippine authorities as to the location they most desired. However, that is a detail which I think would be better left to the judgment of the authorities erecting the memorial.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Is there a commission already selected to handle the location and erect the memorial, and if not, who will have charge of that?

Mr. LUCE. The War Department would have charge of it, as I understand.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I think that whether there is a commission or whether there is authority in the War Department, that Congress ought not to attempt to designate a fountain or something else, but I think latitude ought to be given the commission or War Department to select the location and select a memorial to fit the location. In legislating in this way we can not assume to know what is most fitting, and I do not believe a limitation like this ought to be placed on the commission or on the department.

Mr. LUCE. If the gentleman will permit me, the bill itself says that the designs and plans for such monument shall be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Then the department ought to be given some latitude in selecting the location and the design that will fit the location rather than undertake to do it here in the bill.

Mr. LUCE. It seems to me so.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. Certainly.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have a great deal of sympathy with the views expressed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], that this memorial, because that is what it will be, commemorates highly important services that are of an epochal character in the history of the Philippines, and I wonder if it would be agreeable to the gentleman if we would eliminate from the bill section 2. This would mean that the secretary would be directed to go ahead, with the help of the National Commission on Fine Arts, in the preparation of plans. There would be no money spent until Congress made the necessary appropriation, but they would not be cramped in the scope of their project, as they will be if section 2 becomes law.

Mr. LUCE. I should have no objection to that.

Mr. JENKINS. I should like to ask the gentleman a question. In view of the fact that this distinguished man comes from my State I feel it is incumbent upon me to see to it, if I possibly can, that this bill will not be passed over to-day, but I should like to know who or what agency is sponsoring this movement.

Mr. LUCE. Officers from the War Department came to the committee—

Mr. JENKINS. Does not the gentleman think that, because of the greatness of this man, probably the greatest of all great Ohians, if we are going to provide any kind of memorial for him in the Philippines, that this small sum of \$35,000 is greatly out of proportion to the greatness of the man?

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit, the gentleman from Massachusetts has already agreed to accept an amendment eliminating section 2, and it seems to me—

Mr. DYER. If the gentleman will permit, if we eliminate that section there will not be any amount fixed as to what the monument or memorial eventually will cost. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin and others are quite correct in objecting to a \$35,000 memorial in the Philippines for a man who has been the Governor General of the Philippines, the Secretary of War, the President of the United States, and the Chief Justice of the United States. We can not separate the distinctions that came to this great man.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Of course, the \$35,000 limit will simply mean an architectural design; in other words, it will be a sort of glorified tombstone.

Mr. DYER. That is about all.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. You can not get much further than that with that amount of money. Now, what they have in mind is not a colossal statue or a heroic statue, but an architectural monument of limited size, of course; and that

would cost, the chairman of the Fine Arts Commission informed me, at least \$50,000; but if you want to carry out the idea suggested by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], and you want to put up a monument of heroic or colossal size, your present figure will not even touch it.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit, I think anyone who had the slightest contact with the late Chief Justice would say that he would abhor a monument, a reproduction of a human figure.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. That is not necessary.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is not at all necessary, but what will no doubt be found desirable would be some memorial, whether fountain or otherwise, and the character of it would only be determined upon after a study of a situation in the Philippines. It seems to me what Congress ought to do is to give authority for the study to be made and for the plans to be made and leave it for a later Congress to determine the amount of money.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Instead of striking out section 2 altogether, would it not be well to provide for a report to be made to the Congress? This would come with the sanction of the department, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, and possibly with the recommendation of the President.

Mr. CRAMTON. That would be the effect if you eliminate section 2. The Secretary of War will go ahead with his responsibilities, plans will be made, an estimate will go to the Budget, the Budget will transmit that estimate to Congress, and then you will have it all before you.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman has studied the bill carefully; is the first part of the bill a sufficient authorization for that course?

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, absolutely.

Mr. JENKINS. If the gentleman will yield to me; would the bill as the gentleman suggests be comprehensive enough to authorize the Secretary of War to deal with the Philippine people, or with the Philippine Legislature, if that is necessary, so that when this matter progresses it may proceed unhampered and may ultimately result in what we all apparently want. It is apparent that there is a unanimous sentiment in favor of providing a memorial entirely fitting to this great American.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I had not desired to intrude too much on this bill, but it would be my own thought that the Secretary of War being given this responsibility would very naturally consult with others interested, and certainly the authorities and the people of the Philippines should be consulted in order to get any suggestions they might have. It would seem to me, if I may be pardoned for making the suggestion, it would be quite proper for the Secretary of War to constitute a commission especially to study this matter under his direction.

Mr. JENKINS. I think the gentleman's suggestion is a good one.

Mr. DYER. I am opposed to the small amount involved and having the Secretary of War do this.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. It is going to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DYER. There ought to be a commission to take it up and not limit it simply to a memorial to Mr. Taft as Governor of the Philippines, but it should take in the history of his entire life.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I hope the gentleman is not contaminated with the commission germ.

Mr. DYER. I do not want any commission; we have the Fine Arts Commission, and I am in favor of their doing it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The reason I am not offering the usual amendment is that I have the assurance of the Fine Arts Commission that only the design of American artists would be accepted. I think we have all of the safeguards here that are necessary.

Mr. DYER. I think a report made by the Fine Arts Commission would be sufficient.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The War Department, under the law, is charged with the jurisdiction of the Philippine Islands, and there is no other authority over them.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to add to the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan a clause that the Fine Arts Commission may take the matter up with the Filipino people through their legislature. I want the responsibility placed in the hands of the Fine Arts Commission, and not in the hands of the Secretary of War.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit, in answer to his suggestion, our administrative officers in the Philippines are under the Secretary of War.

Mr. DYER. The time is not far distant when the Filipino people will have the authority to act for themselves.

Mr. CRAMTON. But that matter is not before us now.

Mr. DYER. It ought to be.

Mr. CRAMTON. I feel sure that the Secretary of War, having this debate before him, will handle this along the line that will meet fully with the approval of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DYER. What is the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. CRAMTON. To strike out section 2. In section 1 it provides that all plans will have to be approved by the Fine Arts Commission. I do not see how it is possible for the Fine Arts Commission to directly consult the Filipinos.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I think it ought to be under the Secretary of War. The Fine Arts Commission will approve of the artistic design. It should rest with the Secretary of War. I do not think the limit of \$35,000 is a figure sufficient to permit the Secretary of War to build the right kind of memorial.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask a question of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. MONTAGUE. As I understand it, the limit is not sufficient to erect a monument of impressive proportions to the character of Mr. Taft?

Mr. LUCE. May I say that \$35,000, if I am rightfully informed, was about the cost of the statue to Henry Clay, also the cost of the Ericsson memorial here, on the water front of Potomac Park?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am not criticizing that, but I was making the suggestion that the character of the monument indicated does not compare with the achievements of Mr. Taft. Do I understand that there is a bill contemplated to erect a monument in this country to Mr. Taft?

Mr. LUCE. I have not heard of such a bill.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the country has not awakened to that then, may I say that in building a monument to him we should build it to Mr. Taft as Commissioner, Governor General of the Philippine Islands. He had not reached the eminence at that time which gentlemen speak of.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection. The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to select a site at Manila, Philippine Islands, and to provide for the erection thereon of a suitable monument to William Howard Taft. The design and plans of such monument shall be approved by the National Commission on Fine Arts.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the word "monument" in lines 5 and 6 and insert the word "memorial."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. STAFFORD: Lines 5 and 6, strike out the word "monument" and insert the word "memorial."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the second section, as follows:

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$35,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this resolution.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out section 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended.

MEDALS AND AWARDS TO GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12922) providing for medals of honor and awards to Government employees for distinguished service in science or for voluntary risk of life and health beyond the ordinary risks of duty.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I prefer to have this bill go over without prejudice for two weeks.

Mr. LUCE. Will the gentleman give me an idea of what he questions in the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. I have given some consideration to the bill. I question the propriety, no matter whether it be the National Academy of Science or of any other society, to pass judgment on the claims of Government employees to receive these medals of honor and these other insignia. I also question the propriety of this democratic government proceeding with the idea of providing decorations to any of our civilian class, thereby creating rivalry and possible dissatisfaction among employees who are not recognized. I want to give further consideration to that thought. That is uppermost in my mind at the present time. I ask that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CLAIM OF CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW TRIBES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 3165) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, consider, and report upon a claim of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian Nations or Tribes for fair and just compensation for the remainder of the leased district lands.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will withhold his objection for a moment.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I withhold that request, but I reserve the right to object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I may say that I have discussed with the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. HASTINGS, and the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, some amendments to this bill which have the approval of the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. HASTINGS, and, I think, also of the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. CARTWRIGHT. With those amendments I would not object to the bill. I think I should state for the RECORD what the changes are. Page 1, lines 5 and 6, I suggest to strike out the words "that they have never received fair and just" and insert the word "for." That is simply striking out some historical allegations that may or may not be true. On page 2, in lines 10 to 13, strike out the words "taking into consideration the circumstances and conditions under which said lands were acquired, and purposes for which they were used, and the final disposition thereof." Then, in lieu of the committee amendment in lines 13 to 18, insert: "In said suit the Court of Claims shall also hear, examine, and report on all claims which the United States may have against the said Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, and any payment which may have been made by the United States, including gratuity, for the benefit of any said Indians or for their support and civilization shall not operate as an estoppel, but may be pleaded as a set-off to said suit." That is the language usually in such a bill. On page 2, in line 21, I move to strike out "six months" and insert "one year." I think six months is too short a time to make the bill effective. Page 3, lines 19 to 20, I would strike out "the sum of not to exceed" and insert "such sums as may be necessary, not exceeding." Page 4, strike out, in line 7, the word "them" and insert "such attorneys."

Most of these amendments are textual and probably not of much effect. The most important, to my mind, is the substitute for the committee amendment on page 2. With those amendments I would have no objection to the bill.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I shall briefly inform the gentleman that the reason why I desire that this bill be not passed at this time is so that I can have an opportunity to complete an investigation of it. I desire to determine whether a notorious lobbyist, Louis R. Glavis, who has been on the pay roll of the Senate Indian Affairs Committee as an investigator for many months, has appeared before the House committee or before the committee of the Senate in favor of this bill. In the 1928 primary political campaign in Wisconsin another notorious lobbyist, Richard H. Lee, of New York, sent \$5,000 to the La Follette Progressive Republican Club, of Milwaukee County, which was received and expended in a chain system of campaigning in violation of the Wisconsin corrupt practices acts, and the candidate for governor in whose behalf some of this money was received and expended by that club, under oath before an investigating committee of the Wisconsin Legislature testified that he did not know this Lee very well, but he knew his partner, Louis R. Glavis, very well. I have in my possession an original letter sent by this former investigator of the Senate Indian Affairs Committee to the representative of an Indian tribe in Wisconsin asking for a \$5,000 fee to have a bill which they favor passed by Congress. I feel constrained to object to the consideration of all Indian bills where attorneys' fees enter into them until I am sure that this Glavis, this Senate investigator, a contemptible lobbyist, is not interested financially in their passage. If the gentleman from Oklahoma can assure me that Glavis and his partner Lee have no connection whatever with this bill, I shall not press my objection at this time.

Mr. HASTINGS. I say to the gentleman that I don't know the gentleman he speaks of, I never heard of him, that he has no connection whatever with this bill. He has no fee or promise of fee, and I want to make the language as emphatic and as broad as the English language can make it, I absolutely guarantee to the gentleman from Wisconsin that he has no connection with it whatever.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Or his partner, the other notorious lobbyist, Lee, who polluted our 1928 Wisconsin primary election with his slush funds.

Mr. HASTINGS. None whatever.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. With that assurance, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. I renew the request that the bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Let me say, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. STAFFORD. The Committee on Indian Affairs will be reached within the week.

Mr. HASTINGS. It may or it may not; but will the gentleman withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. STAFFORD. Certainly.

Mr. HASTINGS. This bill has been on the calendar for a long time. I do not want to object to a reasonable request by any Member. I want to give all the time necessary for study and consideration of the bill. It is not our idea to press unduly for consideration of it, but this bill simply sends it to the court for a report—

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, all of this matter has been heard by the Supreme Court and reported on adversely. I will say in frankness to the gentleman that I went over this matter carefully since the last call of the Consent Calendar. I want to examine the decisions of the Supreme Court referred to in the letter.

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman will promise us that he will give due consideration to it within the next week, as far as I am concerned I do not want to unduly press it, and I yield to his request.

Mr. STAFFORD. I went over this carefully, but I have not had time to examine the decisions of the court.

Mr. HASTINGS. Well, it only refers it to the court for an investigation and collection of all the facts and report back to Congress in lieu of a committee of Congress taking the time that it has not got to investigate all the details of this claim.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. DYER. May I inquire of the gentleman from Oklahoma if the amendments suggested by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] are satisfactory?

Mr. HASTINGS. As far as I can see after a hurried reading of them, I do not see any objection to them. I have not had an opportunity to give them thorough study.

Mr. DYER. Then we will be able to pass the bill at next consent day. It is very deserving legislation.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard very briefly at this time. I am delighted that my genial friend from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] has withdrawn his opposition and I sincerely trust that his colleague [Mr. STAFFORD] will also withdraw his opposition. I feel sure he would not further oppose this bill if he were familiar with the history of the claim.

The leased district is so called because in 1855 the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians leased the land in question to the Government for the settlement of certain other tribes of Indians. The claim grows out of article 3 of the treaty of 1866, by the terms of which the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations ceded to the United States their lands lying between the ninety-eighth and one hundredth degrees of west longitude, bounded by the Red River on the south and Canadian River on the north. The leased district originally comprised about 7,700,000 acres of land. The Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian Tribes have received no compensation from the Government for these lands, except for that part which was assigned to the Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians in 1891, amounting to 2,400,000 acres.

These lands were opened as public domain to white settlers and sold by the Government of the United States at the rate of \$1.25 per acre. The Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations believe that when these lands were opened to settlers and sold, a violation of the treaty of 1866 occurred, and the money received by the Government from the sale belongs to the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians.

At intervals since 1866 the two tribes have sought an adjustment, carrying their case to Congress and to the Supreme Court. The court recognized the allegations of the Indians that they had been treated unfairly to the extent of suggesting that if an injustice had been done the remedy was up to Congress; and that is why this bill is before you, the purpose of which in substance is to authorize the Court of Claims to inquire into and report to Congress whether or not the consideration paid for the lands involved was fair and just to the tribes, and if not, whether the United States should pay additional compensation therefor, and if so, what amount should be paid.

The Federal Government paid the Seminoles for similar lands under similar conditions \$1.25 per acre. The Federal Government paid the Creeks for similar lands under similar conditions \$1.25 per acre. The Federal Government paid the Cherokees \$1.42 per acre for similar lands under similar conditions.

The Senate and the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House have held that the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations are entitled to the amount for which the lands were sold, less the lands allotted to the Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians and less the cost of sale. Why hold this bill up here?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]?

There was no objection.

USE OF OSAGE INDIAN FUNDS FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 13132) authorizing the use of Osage funds for attorneys' fees and expenses of litigation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, I have no objection to the general purpose of the bill. I appreciate the need of something of this kind, but it seems to me very possible that the amount of money, \$100,000, is much more than should be needed. The bill is simply an authorization for the appropriation of "not to exceed the sum of \$100,000." I would like to know from those interested in the bill what would be their construction of that. Suppose this bill becomes law, the gentlemen will come before the Appropriations Committee. They first go to the Budget and the department, and then come to the Appropriations Committee of Congress, asking for an appropriation. Is the department and the Budget and our committee then to be told that since Congress passed this bill we must appropriate \$100,000, or can the needs be gone into with care, and no more money appropriated than seems to be necessary?

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. LEAVITT. As far as my own responsibility goes, as chairman of the committee, I would say that they should be gone into, and that this is not a mandatory amount. It is simply the maximum limitation.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman is not only chairman of the committee, but he is the introducer of the bill. I am satisfied that the department who prepared the bill will never urge that more be appropriated than they feel is necessary. I want to be sure that our action in passing the bill is not brought up to us as a mandate for the appropriation of that much money.

Mr. LEAVITT. In my judgment it would not be.

Mr. CRAMTON. With that understanding, accepting the gentleman's statement that it would not be, I would not feel inclined to object to the bill. I will say frankly that I would have objected otherwise.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, there is one thing that is not clear to me. This bill is introduced with the expectation that two previous acts of Congress will be attacked in the future. It has always been my impression that where the validity of existing law is attacked it is the duty of the Attorney General to defend that law. That being so, why is it necessary to go outside and compel these Indians to spend their own money, when it is the duty of the Attorney General to defend the validity of the two acts, that is the act of March 3, 1921, and the act of March 2, 1929?

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. HASTINGS. When this bill was considered two weeks ago, it being a bill that affected my own State, I joined with others in asking permission that this matter go over two weeks in order that I might give it some study. It does affect a tribe of Indians in Oklahoma. The mineral rights were reserved for a certain length of time, under the original allotment act, and that time would have expired on the 8th day of April, 1931. Prior to that time and on the date mentioned this mineral period was extended. Meantime a great many people have bought the surface of the same land prior to the passage of this act extending the mineral rights. Those individuals claim that when they bought the surface rights that they bought all the mineral rights as well.

I know there will be a legal contest immediately after the 8th day of April of this year.

In answer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] I have had a little experience with some of this Indian litigation, and let me say to the gentleman that we find in about all Indian litigation that the Indians are only perfunctorily represented by the Department of Justice; and where there is so large an amount involved as there is in this bill we think the Indians ought to be represented by their own attorneys.

I am in sympathy with the remarks made by the gentleman from Michigan. I am rather inclined to think that the \$100,000 is a rather large amount for the defense of an act which only calls in question the power of Congress to ex-

tend it, but in view of the remarks made by the gentleman from Michigan and in view of the fact that I know the Committee on Appropriations will be allowed to go into the question of the services and the amount which ought to be contracted for and can put another limitation upon it, I think this bill ought to pass. There is a great deal involved in this bill. Here are 1,500,000 acres of land and practically all of it is underlaid with oil and gas. There is a great deal involved in this case.

I see the gentleman from Wisconsin on his feet. Let me assure the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] that the gentleman he inquired about a while ago has nothing whatever to do with this litigation; he is not going to have, and no one associated with him is going to have, any connection with it if this legislation is enacted, so far as I know.

Mr. CRAMTON. As I understand it, it is not the custom of the Indians of Oklahoma or the department in their behalf to employ any disbarred lawyers to handle their claims.

Mr. HASTINGS. Well, I know they have not in the past and I hope they will not in the future.

Mr. CRAMTON. But certain legislative committees in another body are not so particular.

Mr. HASTINGS. I think this legislation ought to pass.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think the RECORD should show that this is a proposed appropriation of Indian funds to protect their own interests.

Mr. HASTINGS. And nothing is to be paid out of the Treasury but from Osage funds.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker reserving the right to object, I think the amount is so large as to immediately challenge the serious consideration of this committee. While I am very loath indeed to object to any measure introduced by our efficient chairman of the House Indian Affairs Committee, yet here is the authorization of an appropriation of \$100,000 from the tribal funds of the Osage Indians in my State. For what? Not for suits that are pending but for supposititious cases and in anticipation of litigation that may arise later on. In order to determine the amount necessary it seems to me some information relative to the legal questions involved may be material. If the committee will examine the report made, it will find that it involves the construction of the extension act of 1906. Read carefully that portion preceding section 3.

That nothing herein shall authorize the sale of the oil, gas, coal, or other minerals covered by said lands, said minerals being reserved to the use of the tribe for a period of 25 years, and the royalty to be paid to said tribe as hereinafter provided.

Here is a specific, definite, and positive reservation of the mineral rights in the land to the tribe.

And provided further, That the oil, gas, coal, and other minerals upon said allotted land shall become the property—

Now, here is the language which may give some little color to the contention that they say is about to be made—

That the oil, gas, coal, and other minerals upon said allotted lands shall become the property of the individual owner of said land at the expiration of said 25 years, unless otherwise provided for by act of Congress.

Now, listen to this language:

Unless otherwise provided for by act of Congress.

This proviso was notice to purchasers of the retention of jurisdiction by the Congress. Congress otherwise provided by the act of March 3, 1921, extending the original 25-year trust period to April 8, 1946, and subsequently, by the act of March 2, 1929 (44 Stat. 1478), further extended said trust period until April 8, 1958. By these several acts Congress extended the reservation of the oil, gas, coal, and other minerals covered by the lands to the use of the tribe until 1958.

In view of the fact that the act must be construed as a whole, let me read section 3:

That the oil, gas, coal, or other minerals covered by the lands for the selection and division of which provision is herein made are hereby reserved to the Osage Tribe for a period of 25 years, and after the 8th day of April, 1906, and leases for all oil, gas, and other minerals covered by selections and divisions of land herein provided for may be made by the Osage Tribe of Indians through

its tribal council, and with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe.

Now, section 5, and this is the concluding section of that part of the act which deals with the mineral rights of the lands involved.

That at the expiration of the period of 25 years from and after the 1st day of January, 1907, the lands, mineral interests, and moneys, herein provided for and held in trust by the United States shall be the absolute property of the individual members of the Osage tribe, according to the roll herein provided for, or their heirs, as herein provided.

So that when you construe this act as a whole it clearly appears from the act itself that the intention of the Congress was to reserve these mineral rights to the Osage Indians and to their respective members, as they appeared upon the rolls as provided for in that act, and every purchaser of lands was notified by the act itself that Congress reserved the right to enact the amendatory extensions cited. This reveals the character of the litigation involved. What is it? It is simply the construction of a congressional act, and what does that mean? It means that the question involved is simply the construction of the act which can be submitted to the court on an agreed stipulation of fact. It does not mean a search for and an investigation of evidence which very often takes much time. It does not mean an examination and cross-examination of witnesses in court and the necessary attendance of the attorneys in court. It simply means an agreed stipulation of fact to present this one question for a construction of the statute.

Now, what would be a reasonable attorney's fee in a case of this kind? Why, at once anyone would say that \$10,000 would be a very liberal fee; for legal services in such a case \$10,000 would certainly be ample compensation, where the questions involved are as stated. They say this is merely an authorization for \$100,000. That is true. An authorization is not an appropriation, but an authorization is a constant and standing temptation for excessive appropriations.

I therefore will object unless the authorization is cut to \$50,000, and even then it will exceed any prospective need that is shown here or which could arise in the future through this litigation.

As was stated by the gentleman from New York, whose duty is it to secure a construction of this statute?

The Government of the United States voluntarily assumed the obligations of guardianship. The Government of the United States voluntarily having assumed the duties of guardianship and having enacted the legislation which is now alleged to be in doubt, upon it devolves the responsibility of furnishing these Indians with adequate legal services to secure a proper construction of the act.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will my colleague from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman will remember that with respect to the Osages they pay every dollar of their own expenses. We appropriated this year \$264,000 out of the Osages' funds to pay their expenses for this coming fiscal year, and we have appropriated or authorized to be expended out of their funds about the same amount for this year. The extension of the mineral period involves quite a question and is of great importance to the Osages. There is a great amount of property involved, and let me say that I am in sympathy with the remarks of my colleague in criticizing this sum as excessive, but I want to assure him that the amount will not be regarded as mandatory, and I want to also assure my colleague that in the event of this legislation being passed, that before any expenditure is made or before any appropriation is made, the Committee on Appropriations will very, very carefully consider all of the questions involved in coming to a conclusion as to what is a fair and equitable amount to be paid to attorneys employed, and that the Committee on Appropriations will not regard this legislation as mandatory, and in fact we serve notice now that we will not regard the amount as mandatory. The gentleman from Michigan has already made a statement to this effect. The chairman of the committee has acquiesced in that statement and has agreed that this amount shall not be

regarded as mandatory. I do not want to be a party to having this Congress adjourn without any legislation, and I take the responsibility myself of saying that where an Indian tribe has so much involved, they should not be prevented from expending a part of their own funds in defending their own property, and I want to say further to my colleague that from all the experience I have had, and every other attorney has had the same experience in Indian litigation, they are only perfunctorily represented by the Government of the United States, and the best and most effective representation an Indian tribe has ever had is through the employment of some special attorney, and the only suits they have ever won—and I challenge you to point to any others—have been where they have employed special attorneys to look after and defend such cases for them.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma and Mr. LAGUARDIA rose.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. The gentleman must agree that my statement as to the questions involved and the procedure concerned is correct.

Mr. HASTINGS. Oh, yes. It involves a question of law; but the gentleman knows and I know that this is going to be tested on and after April 8, 1931.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. I want to ask the gentleman this question: If the law had been properly administered, there never would have been any question raised, in view of the fact the Secretary of the Interior had to approve those conveyances or those deeds, and if he had put the reservation into deeds reserving the mineral rights, carrying out the intention of this statute, no question could have been raised here.

Mr. HASTINGS. In answer to my colleague, I believe that all of that statute is read into the deed anyhow.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. If it is, then we have the intention of Congress expressed, and there can be no mistake about it.

Mr. HASTINGS. I agree with my colleague as to the intention of Congress. We do not disagree over the legal question. I believe, however, that the Osage Tribe of Indians ought to be allowed to be represented and to pay for it out of their own funds, and I want to assure my colleague that no extravagant appropriation will be made if this bill passes if I can prevent it.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think I can clarify this matter somewhat. This bill authorizes the Osage Council, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to use so much of \$100,000 as may be necessary. It may be \$50 or it may be \$10,000, but they are not limited, and the council of 10 or 12 men representing the tribe—intelligent people, some of them lawyers—together with the Secretary of the Interior, are authorized to use so much of this money as may be necessary to employ counsel. Now, to do what? To try a lawsuit involving from \$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Now, there is just where I differ from the gentleman from Kansas. It does not involve that amount. It simply involves the amount of minerals under any quarter section of land in dispute.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. But the decision of the court will affect the title to all the mineral in and under more than a million acres of their land.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. The general results might involve that amount, but no such amount would be involved in any single suit.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Oh, no; but that is immaterial.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Now, does the gentleman from Kansas know that during the last 10 years the per capita payments from the Osage tribal funds have decreased from \$8,600 to \$2,480?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Oh, yes.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Where have those funds gone? A large amount of them have been wasted and dissipated by bad administration.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Oh, I do not think so, altogether.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. In a large degree.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. There is no question but what the sum of from \$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000 is involved in this

matter. Nobody knows just how much the property is worth, and the authorization is to use only so much of the Indians' money, not exceeding \$100,000, as may in the judgment of the council and the Secretary of the Interior be necessary to properly present the Indians' law side of the controversy in the United States district court, the United States circuit court of appeals, and the United States Supreme Court, three Federal courts; and the Indians say it is their own money. They are not chumps, they are not fools, and they know something about what ought to be done, and inasmuch as it is their money, it does seem to me we ought to pass this legislation. I might say to the gentleman from Oklahoma, Judge GARBER, that originally I entertained the same views that he did concerning the amount of money proposed for attorney fees to be used for the protection of the Indians' legal rights. The bill as originally drawn authorized the appropriation of \$100,000 of the Indians' tribal money. But this was amended by the committee so as to read:

To authorize so much of \$100,000 as in the judgment of the council and the Secretary of the Interior might be necessary to employ suitable counsel to represent the Indians' rights.

The bill was otherwise strengthened by amendments in such way as to better protect Indians' rights to the property.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement and the assurance of the chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee that the authorization shall be no index to the amount, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. DYER. I think the gentleman is right in his action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendment to the bill, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause, as follows:

That the Osage Tribal Council is hereby authorized to employ an attorney or attorneys, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to represent the interests of the Osage Tribe in any suits or actions to be brought by the Osage Tribe or to defend any suit or actions to be brought by anyone against the Osage Tribe or any oil or gas or other mineral lessee in any court having jurisdiction of such suits or actions, involving the validity of that part or portion of the acts of March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1249), and March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 1478), extending the period of ownership in the Osage Tribe of the oil, gas, and mineral rights in and under the lands in Osage County belonging to the Osage Tribe; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated from the oil and gas royalties and bonuses accruing and to accrue to the Osage Tribe of Indians not to exceed the sum of \$100,000 to pay attorneys' fees and all other expenses in the prosecution or defense of said litigation. Said fund shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Interior on bills approved by the Osage Tribal Council and the superintendent of the Osage Agency.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out in the title the word "use" and insert the word "appropriation."

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HASTINGS: Page 1 in the title, strike out the word "use" and insert the word "appropriation."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I can not see much difference in the substitution of the word "appropriation" for the word "use." Perhaps my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma can.

Mr. HASTINGS. You could authorize and it might not require an appropriation.

AMENDING THE NATURALIZATION LAWS AS TO THE COMPETENCY OF WITNESSES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10670) to amend the naturalization laws in respect of competency of witnesses.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I object.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Reserving the right to object, I should like to call the attention to a situation which comes up under this bill that I have spoken of before several times. There has been recently a discussion on the amendment of revision of rules of the House. Here are bills on the Consent Calendar with a minority report and the committee amendments. I submit that in the revision of the rules whether it would be considered wise to permit that bill to go on the Consent Calendar when there is a minority report against the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I say that, although gentlemen have originally preferred minority views, when the bill comes up they might not have cohorts enough to prevent its consideration.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. In spite of the minority report there must be some hope of putting it over on consent day.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I object.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE OHIO RIVER AT SISTERSVILLE, W. VA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 4665) extending the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at Sistersville, Tyler County, W. Va.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, this is the first of a number of private bridge bills on the Calendar. I want to go on record as being opposed to every one of such bills. I realize that it is useless to object to the bills, because in a few days they will be brought back in an omnibus bill, and passed.

I favor all bills extending to the States and municipalities the right to construct bridges but where the grant is given to an individual or corporation I oppose them, and want to be so recorded.

Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that the chairman of the subcommittee on bridges has repeatedly on the floor promised those of us who are opposed to the private toll bridges to grant a hearing on the bills that have been introduced, his bill, my bill, and other bills to revise the general bridge act. The promise has never been kept. I do not think that we will get a hearing before the 4th of March; but we will in the next Congress.

It is my firm belief that the publicity which has been given to the discussion of these bills on the floor of the House has resulted in destroying the bond market for private toll bridges. This bill confirms that statement because the original act was passed in 1927, and this is the third time that they have come to Congress and asked for an extension. They can not get the money to go ahead. The people refuse to buy the bonds for they know that the project they are advocating is not from the standpoint of necessity, but simply for convenience.

I want to record my objection to all of the bills—and I will vote against them—the one from my own city, St. Louis, included.

I prevented the passage of one bridge bill giving a private individual the right to construct a bridge in the county adjoining my city. What happened? Why the State of Missouri is building a free bridge, so if my fight against toll bridges has done no more than to get this free bridge it has been worth while.

We have a bridge across the Missouri River between St. Louis and St. Charles County, Mo. For the information of the Members and the country let me tell you what a committee of citizens have accomplished with that bridge. They organized a free bridge committee and bought the bridge for \$1,200,000, made numerous repairs, constructed a new roadway of concrete, and so forth. They spent a great deal of money in this way. The bridge was taken over in 1927.

Since 1927 this free bridge committee has paid a total of \$967,228 which represent the net profits. Just think of it, and the round trip charge is but 45 cents for an automobile. They will soon make the final payment and then the chairman, Judge Sam Hodgdon, will, acting for the committee,

turn the bridge over to the State with the distinct understanding that it shall be forever free to the public.

That is an example of the tolls collected on some private toll bridges. Of course there are not many that make this amount of money but there are some, such as the De Valls Bluff (Ark.), toll bridge recently taken over by the State of Arkansas. There are numerous bills on the calendar providing for extension of time. This is due to the fact the promoters can not finance them. The general public has lost so much money buying bridge bonds it is very hard to get a responsible investment banker to handle such bonds.

All that is necessary to prevent the construction of private toll bridges is to keep the public informed of the losses sustained by those who have invested in private toll-bridge bonds. This information has been given by the press to the entire country and slowly but surely the private toll-bridge promoter is being eliminated from the picture.

As I said before the House by several record votes has shown a disposition to pass legislation of this character and therefore it is useless to object because the bills would be back in an omnibus bill and passed in a few weeks. I predict that few, if any, private toll bridges authorized at this session will be constructed. The people have been educated, they will not subscribe for the bonds.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, permit me to say to my colleague from Missouri that the way to record his objection is to object. I object.

Mr. HOGG of West Virginia. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. HOGG of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat impressed by the statement made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] calling attention to the fact that there had already been an extension of this particular authorization. I became a Member of this body only on December 1, last. My predecessor had been deceased for almost a year, and the extension of this particular authorization was held up on account of the fact that our district had no representation during that period. While this particular bill has the earmarks of being a private enterprise, I assure the gentleman from Missouri, and the Members of the House, that it is in reality not a private undertaking. The mayor and quite a number of the citizens of Sistersville are interested, technically, in their private capacity, but in reality as public officials, and, in addition to that, we have a State bridge commission in West Virginia which is cooperating in every particular to free all toll bridges in our State. This particular project has taken definite shape. These people have expended vast sums of money out of their own pockets, purely as a public undertaking. I assure the Members of the House that this is not a financing project. It is a project which has been undertaken in the best of faith, and I believe it will be a great misfortune to withhold the authorization of this extension. I trust the gentleman will withdraw his objection.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Perhaps the gentleman will state whether the promoters have spent any money in commencing the actual construction of the bridge.

Mr. HOGG of West Virginia. The 1929 session of the West Virginia Legislature created what is known as the State Bridge Commission of West Virginia. That temporarily held up all of these private undertakings until plans could be made to conform to the organization of the West Virginia State Bridge Commission. I might further say that in instances where the construction of a private toll bridge or any kind of a toll bridge has not conformed to the plan of the West Virginia Bridge Commission, the commission has made its own objection before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. That does not reply to my suggestion. This bridge was originally authorized by act of Congress February 20, 1928. The gentleman will concede, I am sure, that there has been no actual construction commenced.

Mr. HOGG of West Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. And the only money expended has been in a promotion scheme to try to peddle the bonds or stock.

Mr. HOGG of West Virginia. No; it is not a promotion scheme. As I am informed by these people, they have expended money in procuring traffic surveys and in a number of other ways. I am not able to give an itemized statement of the expenditures.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The report is barren on that?

Mr. HOGG of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Suppose we pass it over without prejudice, and I will talk with the gentleman in the meantime.

Mr. JENKINS. Is it not a fact that in West Virginia the policy of the legislature is to meet the objections that have been made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and to free all bridges from any toll if possible?

Mr. HOGG of West Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. STAFFORD. And may I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] that there are on the calendar several extension bills that have been extended frequently. This is the first time this company has asked for an extension. The original authorization is not two years old.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. This is the way I am guided: Where actual construction has been commenced, and it is not completed within the time specified in the original bill, then I think there is some good ground for asking for an extension; but when nothing has been done and construction has not been commenced, and the report is entirely bare of any information upon that, I do not see how I can let the bill pass.

Mr. JENKINS. West Virginia in this moment is being watched by the bridge people all over the country, because it is the pioneer in this movement. I would be glad to see the gentleman withdraw his objection and allow this bill to pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New York withdraw his objection?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I do. I ask unanimous consent to have the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER, ST. LOUIS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12966) authorizing H. C. Brenner Realty & Finance Corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near a point between Cherokee and Osage Streets, St. Louis, Mo.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is one feature of this bill to which I wish to direct an inquiry; that is the recapture clause in lines 12 and 13 on page 3. Under the provisions of the bill the right to recapture without paying anything for good will is limited to five years after the completion of the bridge. It seems to me that that is a very short time. If any public authorities wish to condemn this property, they will have to exercise that right within five years, without paying anything for the good will. Five years is nothing in the lifetime of a bridge construction.

I think that period of time should be extended so that the public authorities would have the right to condemn this bridge within 20 years without payment for the good will.

Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS. That would be satisfactory.

Mr. STAFFORD. With that understanding I have no objection to the bill.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I believe that when you are a good organization man you ought to uphold the hands of the administration. You certainly do not want to be catalogued as an insurgent, and if there is any time when the administration requires support in every way, now is the time, and the Secretary of Agriculture, appointed by the President of the United States, says that he recommends against favorable action on this bill. I am going in this instance to support the administration. I object.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?
Mr. LaGUARDIA. I object.

COMPENSATION, SECRETARY OF TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 769 (H. R. 11368).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. COLLINS. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman proposes to fix the figure at \$4,400?

Mr. MAAS. Yes; so that there will be no actual raise at this time. I will offer such an amendment at the proper time.

Mr. COLLINS. I withdraw the reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the date of passage of this act the salary of the secretary of the Territory of Alaska is fixed at \$5,800 per annum.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MAAS: In line 5, page 1, strike out "\$5,800" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREE HIGHWAY BRIDGE ACROSS HUDSON RIVER BETWEEN ALBANY AND RENSSELAER, N. Y.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 13516) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a free highway bridge across the Hudson River between the cities of Albany and Rensselaer, N. Y.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Hudson River, between the cities of Albany and Rensselaer, N. Y., authorized to be built by the superintendent of public works of the State of New York, by an act of Congress approved January 24, 1930, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from January 24, 1930.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, strike out the figures "1930" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "1931."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS HUDSON RIVER AT THE SOUTHERLY EXTREMITY OF THE CITY OF TROY, N. Y.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 13517) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a free highway bridge across the Hudson River at the southerly extremity of the city of Troy, N. Y.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Hudson River at the southerly extremity of the city of Troy, N. Y., authorized to be built by the superintendent of public works of the State of New York by an act of Congress approved April 18, 1930, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from April 18, 1930.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "1930" and insert in lieu thereof "1931."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS POTOMAC RIVER AT OR NEAR DAHLGREN, VA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 13526) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Potomac River at or near Dahlgren, Va.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Secretary of Agriculture says that almost five years have elapsed since the original authorization was granted to private interests involved in the construction of this bridge, and the department feels that no further extension of time should be granted, and I therefore object.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Will the gentleman withhold his objection a moment?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I withhold it.

Mr. GAMBRILL. I think the statement by the Department of Agriculture is misleading, for it creates an impression that the five years has been the time the promoters of this bridge have had an opportunity to go ahead with its construction. As a matter of fact, the final plans for this bridge were not approved by the War Department until April, 1929, and were not received by the promoters until May, 1929. By the time the final plans were received the condition of the country industrially and financially was such that it was impossible for the promoters to make arrangements for the completion of this bridge. I am assured by responsible people from Maryland and Virginia that if this extension is granted the bridge will be constructed, and I hope the gentleman from New York will withdraw his objection.

I want to add, in further answer to the gentleman from New York and for his benefit, that I do not believe the Congress of the United States should permit itself to be influenced by a statement made by some bureaucrat of the Department of Agriculture. We can not build this bridge out of funds appropriated by the State of Maryland. We are doing all we can for the building of roads, and we are expending every year about \$13,000,000 for the building of good roads in the State of Maryland. We should not allow ourselves to be influenced by recommendations made by some bureaucrat in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. If I may say to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GAMBRILL] the gentleman from New York is the last man in this House to whom the gentleman can make such a reference, but, when I see my poor Secretary of Agriculture abandoned by his whole party, I am going to stand by him, and I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I object, Mr. Speaker.

BRIDGE ACROSS RIO GRANDE RIVER AT OR NEAR SAN BENITO, TEX.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 13532) to extend the time for the construction of the bridge across the Rio Grande at or near San Benito, Tex.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the great authority on international bridges something about this bridge. The Department of Agriculture does not enter into it. I wish the gentleman would enlighten the House.

Mr. GARNER. The Department of Agriculture may have recommended adversely on this bridge, but it does not control the situation in Mexico. I admit that in the United

States, when it comes to building private bridges by private capital, there is some reason for such adverse recommendations, but whenever you go to connect with a foreign country it is a different situation. For instance, if we had all the fees that were charged in this country they would add that much more in Mexico. However, we can not build bridges across the Rio Grande except by private capital. The State of Texas can not build them. There is not a county in the State that can build them. We either have to have a treaty with Mexico providing for free bridges or else Mexico will take the tolls and put them in their till, and we will have them free on this side.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. We had a similar experience in Canada, and the very able Representative from the State of Michigan [Mr. Cramton] went up there and negotiated with the people and got them to accept what I call the Cramton formula, whereby a very satisfactory arrangement was made as to the recapture of the bridge eventually and the erection of the bridge in the meantime. Perhaps it would be a good idea to send the gentleman from Michigan to Mexico.

Mr. GARNER. I imagine that if my friend from Michigan had to go to the City of Mexico for the purpose of making some arrangements he would have greater difficulty than he had when he went to Canada, and it would be under somewhat different conditions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by act of Congress approved February 15, 1929, to be built by the Rio Grande del Norte Investment Co., across the Rio Grande at or near San Benito, Tex., are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 8, strike out the words "the date of approval hereof" and insert in lieu thereof "February 15, 1931."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE AT OR NEAR RIO GRANDE CITY, TEX.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 13533) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Texas how far apart are the bridges as authorized in these two respective bills?

Mr. GARNER. About 75 or 80 miles.

Mr. STAFFORD. It has never been my good fortune to be on the Rio Grande border. Can the gentleman tell me how many international bridges there are over the Rio Grande?

Mr. GARNER. From El Paso to Brownsville, a distance of some 1,200 miles, and counting two bridges at Brownsville, there are seven.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are the tolls the same on all the bridges?

Mr. GARNER. On most of them they are the same, and they are fairly reasonable. Whenever a pedestrian can go across such a bridge for 5 cents I think the gentleman will admit that is a fairly reasonable rate.

Mr. STAFFORD. What do they charge for an ordinary automobile?

Mr. GARNER. Twenty cents, except that on some of the isolated bridges the charge is 50 cents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas whether he has made an investigation to determine whether any of those plutocrats who have had some large tax refunds about which he always complains are interested in the company asking for this franchise?

Mr. GARNER. I can say positively they are not.

Mr. PARKS. I want to say to the gentleman that throughout the United States I do not know of any bridges on which tolls are as cheap as they are in the gentleman's district, and they certainly have not refunded any \$16,000,000, as your party has refunded to the Whitney estate.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. If this bill is enacted, then it will be easier to bring good liquor into this country from Mexico to satisfy the appetites of the wet-drinking, dry-voting statesmen from the Southern States.

Mr. PARKS. When the gentleman says "good liquor," he is talking about something I do not know anything about, because I do not think there is any such stuff.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by act of Congress approved February 15, 1929, to be built by the Rio Grande City-Camargo Bridge Co., across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex., are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 8 strike out the words "the date of approval hereof" and insert in lieu thereof "February 15, 1931."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE DELAWARE RIVER NEAR TRENTON, N. J.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 13536) to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Delaware River near Trenton, N. J.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill be taken from the Speaker's table and considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a Senate bill of similar import will be considered in lieu of the House bill.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for completing the construction of the bridge authorized by act of Congress approved August 24, 1912, to be built by the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co. across the Delaware River near the city of Trenton, N. J., which has heretofore been extended by Congress to August 24, 1931, is hereby extended for a further period of three years from the last-named date: *Provided*, That it shall not be lawful to complete or commence the completion of said bridge until plans thereof shall again be submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers and by the Secretary of War.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE ELK RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14051) to grant the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct and maintain a bridge across the Elk River on the Fayetteville-

Winchester Road near the town of Kelso, Lincoln County, Tenn.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee, and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Elk River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, on the Fayetteville-Winchester Road near the town of Kelso, in Lincoln County, Tenn., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 4, after the word "Tennessee," strike out the words "and its successors and assigns."

On page 2, in line 1, strike out the word "the" where it occurs the second time and insert in lieu thereof the word "an."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

DAM ACROSS THE MAHONING RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14264) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Warren, in the State of Ohio, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a dam across the Mahoning River, in the State of Ohio," approved September 22, 1922.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of Congress approved September 22, 1922, granting the consent of Congress to the city of Warren, Ohio, to construct, maintain, and operate, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, a dam across the Mahoning River, in the city of Warren, in the county of Trumbull, in the State of Ohio, be, and the same is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided,* That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the dam herein referred to be commenced within one year and completed within three years from the date of approval hereof.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE TENNESSEE RIVER, TENN.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14276) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Dayton-Decatur Road between Rhea and Meigs Counties, Tenn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Dayton-Decatur Road between Rhea and Meigs Counties, Tenn., authorized to be built by the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee by an act of Congress approved January 24, 1930, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from January 24, 1931.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, N. Y.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14452) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River near Alexandria Bay, N. Y.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is from my own State, and the Department of Agriculture recommends against it. I therefore object.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE OHIO RIVER, W. VA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14558) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near New Martinsville, W. Va.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE COLUMBIA RIVER, OREG.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14676) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Arlington, Oreg.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

RAILROAD BRIDGE ACROSS THE KANKAKEE RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14681) granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh, Fort Wayne & Chicago Railway Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Kankakee River.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Pittsburgh, Fort Wayne & Chicago Railway Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge and approaches thereunto across the Kankakee River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, on the line between the counties of Laporte and Starke, and in Dewey Township, in Laporte County, and Railroad Township, in Starke County, in the State of Indiana, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to the Pittsburgh, Fort Wayne & Chicago Railway Co., its successors and assigns; and any corporation to which such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or which shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation.

Sec. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the word "thereunto" and insert in lieu thereof the word "thereto."

Page 2, line 9, strike out the word "assigns" and the semicolon and insert in lieu thereof the word "assigns" and a comma.

In line 10, after the word "which," insert the words "or any person to whom."

In line 12, strike out the word "which" and insert the word "who."

In line 15, after the word "corporation," insert the words "or person."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENISON: Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "the Pittsburgh, Fort Wayne & Chicago Railway Co." and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Co."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the same amendment in lines 8 and 9, on page 2.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENISON: Page 2, line 8, strike out the words "the Pittsburgh, Fort Wayne & Chicago Railway Co."

and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Co."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE OHIO RIVER, ILL.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14689) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at Cairo, Ill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I object, Mr. Speaker.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MISS.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15138) granting the consent of Congress to the State highway commission and the board of supervisors of Itawamba County, Miss., to construct a bridge across Tombigbee River.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State highway commission of Mississippi and the board of supervisors of Itawamba County, Miss., and their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a free bridge and approaches thereto across the Tombigbee River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Fulton, in the county of Itawamba, in the State of Mississippi, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the word "and."

Line 7, after the word "free," insert the word "highway."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

PRELIMINARY SURVEY OF HOCKING RIVER, OHIO

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8736) to authorize and direct a preliminary examination of the Hocking River for the distance it flows through Athens County, Ohio.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin what are we going to do with all these surveys of rivers? Sooner or later you will have to adopt some policy, or this is going to be a river and harbor proposition.

Mr. STAFFORD. We are making substantial advance in that direction when we make surveys for floods that only occur once in a lifetime.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, let me say that this is one of six or seven bills reported out by the committee last year. These bills all came on the Consent Calendar about a month ago and have all passed except this one. This was objected to, but for what reason I do not know. There was no reason assigned.

I happen to know about all of these bills. This bill refers to a river in my district and I am familiar with the whole situation. I have made extensive investigation, and I am sure it would be in line with the policy already indicated.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The river has been on its good behavior since 1913.

Mr. JENKINS. How does the gentleman know that?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. From the report.

Mr. JENKINS. The evidence before the committee, and the evidence that I have adduced, shows that this river gets out of bounds with disastrous floods at least twice a year.

It goes through a very rich territory and the boundaries adjoin several very thriving cities. I want to say that it is not contemplated to spend a great amount of money—just for a survey to see what the Government can do to relieve floods, if anything.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I see the gentleman from Arizona on his feet; what does he know about this river?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I rose for the purpose of asking whether or not this stream is navigable?

Mr. JENKINS. That is a question that this survey will disclose. At one time it was navigable for 7 or 8 miles.

Mr. HUDSON. If that is true, this bill should be referred to the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Mr. JENKINS. Oh, no; this is a question of flood control and navigation.

Mr. HUDSON. Flood control enters into any stream.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman withhold that motion?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I will withhold it for a moment.

Mr. JENKINS. I have gone into this matter extensively; I know the situation; and I know it is much more meritorious than bills that have been passed by the Congress at this session. If the gentleman wants any further information about it, I think I can supply it.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. The other bills similar to this were passed by unanimous consent while I was absent from the floor. I came back just in time to pick this up, and I think for the time being it would be as well to let it go over.

Mr. JENKINS. There is a condition with reference to this bill that does not apply to others. In the Ohio River, 2 or 3 miles below the mouth of this river, is a dam. The result is that the pool backs up and floods into the mouth of this river. That is a very desirable situation under some circumstances if the Government would keep the mouth of this river clear. Before the dam was built there was navigation up this river for 6 or 7 miles. Since the Government has built this dam they have not kept the mouth of the river clear, so that small boats that carry produce and sand can go in and out of the stream. It is important that a survey be made, and it can not cost more than \$1,500.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Then why does not the State expend the fund?

Mr. JENKINS. Because the improvement, if made, is contiguous to the Ohio River where only the Government has jurisdiction.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. It is a very interesting question and I shall have to insist.

Mr. HUDSON. The statement of the gentleman from Ohio makes it clear that this is a question of navigation, and not flood control.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

POLICING OF MILITARY ROADS LEADING OUT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8140) to provide for the policing of military roads leading out of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. COLLINS. I object.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I object.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentlemen withhold their objections for a moment?

Mr. COLLINS. Certainly.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I am reserving my objection because I have some amendments which I believe will eliminate the objectionable features of the bill. My objection to the bill is not that it is not one to police military roads, but it would confer jurisdiction on the United States commissioner in that district in Virginia to try people for violations of law committed on that road.

The objections I have may be eliminated by striking out, on page 2, after line 17, the balance of the line and all of lines 18 to 25, both inclusive, and, on page 3, striking out all of lines 1, 2, and 3 and the word "Virginia" in line 4, and then, on page 3, line 19, after the word "Virginia," strike out the remainder of the line and all of lines 20 to 25, both inclusive, and lines 1 and 2 on page 4, and the word "services" in line 3, and to insert in lieu thereof the words "and the courts of the District of Columbia shall have concurrent jurisdiction to try cases of all persons charged with violations of law and/or the said rules and regulations committed on the military roads hereinbefore mentioned." In other words, I would provide for trial in the courts of Virginia and not before the commissioner, and that people committing petty offenses may be brought before the magistrate or the police court, whatever he is called in the District of Columbia, giving that court concurrent jurisdiction. That would remove the juridical features of the bill to which I object.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. As I have already indicated to the gentleman from New York, his amendment would be satisfactory to me. If the amendments were adopted, the bill, if enacted into law, would simply vest jurisdiction in Colonel Grant to police this military road in Arlington County, and the amendments the gentleman has suggested would be entirely acceptable to him.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. All the gentleman from Virginia is interested in is the policing of the roads and not changing the jurisdiction of the United States court.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. Under the amendments proposed it would still leave the National Capital Park Police assigned to duty in Virginia.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. It would.

Mr. SIMMONS. I object.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. SIMMONS. There is no use of doing that. A number of us object to the idea of sending the District of Columbia police outside the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia. That is the fundamental thing in the bill, and as long as we are going to object I see no use in further taking up the time of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

Mr. SIMMONS. I object.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I object.

CONCERNING FALSE REPORT OF THE CONDITION OF NATIONAL BANKS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10560) to amend section 22 of the Federal reserve act. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ASSISTANTS TO CLERK OF STATE COURT IN NATURALIZATION MATTERS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12740) relating to clerical assistants to clerks of State courts, exercising naturalization jurisdiction.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. My objection is to this fiscal arrangement, which is provided in this bill, whereby it permits payment of a salary out of the fees, which would change the policy adopted in all of the departments that all fees are covered into the Treasury and all salaries paid by appropriations.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment that meets the objection suggested by the gentleman from New York, and I understand that my amendment is agreeable to those in charge of the bill. If so, I would not object. If the amendment were not accepted, however, I would join the gentleman from New York in objecting.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the gentleman from Michigan state what his amendment is, for the benefit of the author of the bill, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT].

Mr. CRAMTON. On page 2, strike out the remainder of the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Payment of such allowances may be made from the appropriation for general expenses of the Bureau of Naturalization under such regulations as the commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, may prescribe.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] has referred to me as the author of this bill. That is hardly correct. The bill is one introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Immigration, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], whose committee has jurisdiction of this subject. It is the outcome of an effort made by me to secure justice and fairness for the taxpayers of my county. My county of Westchester is adjacent to the City of New York, and has a rapidly growing population with a very large number of aliens in it. There is a great naturalization business. That business has been conducted by the clerk of the county of Westchester as the clerk of the supreme court, and it has been found that the allowance which he now receives under the existing statute is very much less than the cost of the service rendered to the Federal Government. Under existing law, which, as I understand, is not fully quoted in the report, he is limited to receive automatically one-half of the fees paid up to a limit of \$6,000. That is to say he is limited to receive as reimbursement for the expense incurred in rendering the service to \$3,000. The existing law provides that where the fees exceed \$6,000 the Commissioner of Naturalization may make an additional allowance, but that the Commissioner of Naturalization has been reluctant to do because that may not come out of the fees but must come out of his appropriation, as the fees are covered into the Treasury. So the clerk of our court has not been able to secure anything over \$3,000 though the actual cost much exceeds that amount.

The bill I introduced was to amend the existing law so that the clerk of my county could receive (and it applies to some of the other large counties adjacent to the large cities where clerks of State courts render the same service) up to the limit of \$6,000. I will say frankly to the House and to the members of the committee, this bill in no way meets the situation in my county and will grant no relief to the taxpayers of my county, because, in order to be operative as the bill has been introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Naturalization, the fees collected must aggregate \$30,000 before the clerk can receive \$6,000. As a matter of fact, that is a prohibitive limit. We are not collecting currently, and have no prospect of collecting anything like \$30,000 in my county of Westchester. Therefore this bill, even if enacted, would not grant the relief which I feel our people are entitled to, and therefore I will say, also frankly, that I am not particularly interested in the passage of this bill in the form in which it is presented to the House, and we must look to the future for adequate relief.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT] is not interested in it, I am going to object to it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. COLLINS, and Mr. LA GUARDIA objected.

VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2113) to aid in effectuating the purposes of the Federal laws for promotion of vocational agriculture.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, this is a bill that comes from the Department of Education which simply takes a state corporation and makes it a Federal corporation. Now, it seems to me that is going a little too far, and, without going into the merits of the bill—

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. REED of New York. We have incorporated Boy Scouts and hundreds of organizations. Now, you have a group of boys organized in different States to aid vocational agriculture. A farmer boy has very little to encourage him in these days to stay on the farm, and yet there are 29,000 boys on the farms of this country taking courses in vocational agriculture who are interested in this bill. They are boys between 14 and 18 years of age. This is quite similar to the 4-H clubs and clubs of that character. The teachers in vocational agriculture have found that this organization, known as the Future Farmers of America, is most effective in interesting the boys in agriculture. This is not establishing a new precedent as far as incorporating boys' clubs is concerned.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was under the impression that the National Congress was very hesitant to give national charters to voluntary organizations of this character.

Mr. REED of New York. I went to the Congressional Library and made a list of the number of corporations authorized by Congress, and it runs into the hundreds.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. They will not from now on.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is against the policy of both the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House. The policy that was laid down some time ago was that there is no power in Congress to incorporate, except in furtherance of some of the delegated powers that Congress has received under the Constitution. We admit, however, there were a number of charters granted improvidently, but we think the position we have taken is sound.

Mr. REED of New York. It is quite evident that in former years statesmen have not taken that position.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. A great many of the corporations to which the gentleman refers are District of Columbia corporations.

Mr. REED of New York. I am not considering those. The only place to which the District of Columbia can go for a charter is to Congress.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Perhaps Congress has been too generous in the past in incorporating such organizations.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. All of us are in favor of encouraging the boys, but how many Federal corporations have been authorized within the last five years? Can the gentleman tell us that?

Mr. REED of New York. I am not concerned about that.

Mr. BLANTON. I am, because I have been watching that matter. These boys can get along without a Federal corporation. They can have a national association. They do not have to be incorporated by the Government. There is no occasion for it.

Mr. REED of New York. They are incorporated in a great many different States to-day, and they would like to centralize their activities. This is the head of government.

Mr. BLANTON. But there are a few of us here who have been watching this matter and keeping down these unnecessary Federal corporations. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. DYER, Mr. LaGUARDIA, and Mr. COLLINS objected.

TEMECULA OR PECHANGA RESERVATION, CALIF.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15064) to reserve 440 acres of public-domain land for addition to the Temecula or Pechanga Reservation, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That 440 acres of land, described as the northwest quarter northeast quarter, each half northeast quarter, and south half section 36, township 8 south, range 2 west, San Bernardino meridian, California, be, and the same are hereby, withdrawn from the public domain and reserved as an addition to the Temecula or Pechanga Indian Reservation, a trust patent to be issued therefor to the land in accordance with and under authority contained in the act of January 12, 1891 (26 Stat. 712), as amended by the act of March 1, 1907 (34 Stat. 1015-1022): *Provided,* That the rights and claims of any bona fide settler initiated under the public land laws prior to September 27, 1930, the date of withdrawal of the land from all form of entry, shall not be affected by this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF RESTRICTIVE PERIOD AGAINST ALIENATION, LEASE, MORTGAGE, ETC., FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15603) to extend the restrictive period against alienation, lease, mortgage, or other encumbrance of any interest of restricted heirs of members of the Five Civilized Tribes and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs whether the notorious former investigator of the Senate and lobbyist, Mr. Louis R. Glavis, or his equally notorious partner, Mr. Richard H. Lee, lobbyist from New York, made any appearance before the gentleman's committee in behalf of this bill?

Mr. LEAVITT. I have never seen the gentlemen in my life, and they have never been before our committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

CRUISER "GALVESTON" SILVER SERVICE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 13160) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Rosenberg Library, in the city of Galveston, Tex., the silver service presented to the United States for the cruiser *Galveston*.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I was asked by a member of the Naval Affairs Committee to object to all bills from the Naval Affairs Committee called during his absence.

Mr. BRIGGS. Surely the gentleman is not going to object to this measure which, I am quite sure, the gentleman referred to participated in reporting. I presume he did, because it is the unanimous report of that committee.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman knows then the member of the Naval Affairs Committee I have in mind and he is quite sure that the passage of this bill will meet with this member's approval.

Mr. BRIGGS. Absolutely.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask this question at the suggestion of my coworker. Why do you incorporate in the bill the words "Rosenberg Library"? Is that a separate institution?

Mr. BRIGGS. The city has merged its interests with the interests of the Rosenberg Library, a philanthropic institution.

Mr. JENKINS. It is strictly a public library?

Mr. BRIGGS. It is.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, under a reservation of objection, I understand this bill only provides for the loaning

of this silver service by the Secretary of the Navy to the Rosenberg Library and that it may be recalled by the Secretary of the Navy in case the department wishes to use the silver service on another vessel.

Mr. BRIGGS. Yes. The bill is in the usual form.

Mr. DYER. Of course, all of these silver services are loaned, and not given outright.

Mr. BRIGGS. The Navy Department does not part with the title.

Mr. DYER. I wish to ask the gentleman whether anything appeared in the hearings showing that the Rosenberg Library is willing to accept this silver service? Does the gentleman know they will accept it?

Mr. BRIGGS. Absolutely; and they have indicated that to me.

Mr. DYER. I have heard of one or two instances where bills were passed to turn over these silver services to certain organizations or societies and then afterwards they declined to receive them.

Mr. BRIGGS. That is not true in this instance. The Rosenberg Library desires to have the custody of this silver service, and that library is the repository for many State relics and Government ones as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Rosenberg Library in the city of Galveston, Tex., for preservation and exhibition, the silver service which was presented to the United States for the cruiser Galveston by the citizens of Galveston, Tex.: Provided, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States for the delivery of such silver service.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PROTEIN CONTENT OF WHEAT

The next business on the consent calendar was the bill (S. 101) to provide for producers and others the benefit of official tests to determine protein in wheat for use in merchandizing the same to the best advantage, and for acquiring and disseminating information relative to protein in wheat, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa the necessity for this bill? Is this going to sell any more wheat for you or are you going to bring in alfalfa. I would like to get some real information about this bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. I will yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT].

Mr. LEAVITT. I will state that this bill is not in the form—since it has been amended by the Committee on Agriculture—as it was when introduced in the Senate by the senior Senator from Montana, Mr. WALSH, and later in the House by myself. A similar bill was introduced by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURTNESS] far in advance of those of either one of us representing Montana.

The proposal is to meet a situation that grows out of the fact that the value of wheat depends very greatly on the protein content, that is, if wheat contains a protein content above certain percentages a premium is paid on it. The full return to the producers from the sale of their wheat thus depends upon that protein content being properly determined. It was to make it certain that the protein content of wheat would be properly determined that the original bills were introduced. There are other reasons behind the introduction of the bill as it was first presented by the gentleman from North Dakota, Mr. BURTNESS, and I would be glad to have him take up the argument at this point.

Mr. STAFFORD. Especially as to oil.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. How about alfalfa?

Mr. LEAVITT. The Agricultural Committee will have to reply to that because they were not in the bill as it was originally introduced.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. You do not expect us city folks to eat alfalfa bread do you?

Mr. HALL of North Dakota. I will state that that provision was suggested by Mr. Olsen of the Agricultural Economics Division.

Mr. HOPE. Alfalfa hay is sold very largely on the basis of its protein content, and dairymen buy it on that basis. It is a matter of importance to the farmers to have an opportunity to have their alfalfa hay tested with regard to its protein content.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I notice there is no report from the Secretary of Agriculture showing any necessity for this additional appropriation or for giving these new duties to the department. It strikes me there are agricultural colleges over the country that are making these analyses, and any individual who wants to get an analysis ought to bear the expense himself. Why do you not get a report from the Secretary of Agriculture showing the necessity of this legislation? There is no report here.

Mr. HOPE. There was a report made to the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice there is no opinion here from the department, and yet you propose to give the department freedom to establish laboratories wherever they desire.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. At a cost of \$75,000 a year.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Why does not the bill include barley as well as wheat?

Mr. LEAVITT. Questions that have to do with the action of the Committee on Agriculture I would have to refer to some member of that committee. I can give the reason for the introduction of the original bill and the necessity for it.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman who reserved the objection yield to me?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURTNESS. I want to suggest, particularly in reply to the question asked by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GREENWOOD], that I feel there is a misunderstanding as to the actual purposes of the bill, in that he overlooks the provision for the making of surveys of protein content. This is not a bill for the primary purpose of authorizing the department to make tests for individual owners of grain at a fee or otherwise. There are laboratories now in existence which do that work, and as I understand it there was no disposition on the part of the Committee on Agriculture of the House to step into the picture and have the Government do that work. Such service will undoubtedly be continued in some States by private laboratories, in other States by State laboratories, and so on; but supplementing the statement made by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT], the situation is this: Nobody knows at the beginning of the marketing season in any given year as to whether protein in that year is going to be worth anything or not. Protein, like most other commodities in a given season, is dependent upon its value with respect to the supply of it in that given crop. To illustrate, in the year 1930, to which I made reference on the floor the other day on another matter, we had a dry year throughout the United States, and protein developed in all the grain that was raised in the United States; there was relatively a less development of starch than usual. The result was that wheat raised in 1930 throughout the country had a higher protein content than is needed for a good mill mix by the millers, but that is not the situation in the average year.

In the average year the wheat produced in the United States is inclined to be low in protein content, depending largely on climatic conditions during the time of maturity of the wheat. When wheat in some sections of the country is low in protein content, this means the millers desire some high protein wheat to be mixed with the wheat of low protein content so as to bring about a mill-mix, we will say, of

12½ per cent protein content, with the result that the millers start bidding up for the higher protein wheats.

What, then, is the purpose of this bill? The real fundamental purpose of it is to permit the Department of Agriculture to make a general survey of the protein content just as early as possible in the marketing season, so the farmers may know, so the millers may know, so the grain trade and everybody else interested may know what the likelihood is in that season for protein; and all with the purpose of stabilizing the value of protein during that marketing season. Of course, if they find that all of the wheat is of high protein content there will not be any premiums. If they find it is low, then the premiums are going to run up; but the trade, and the millers particularly, are immediately interested in finding out what the supply of protein wheat is going to be. In other words, protein is a more important factor some seasons than in others, and therefore differently reflected into the price.

Here is an unfortunate situation that sometimes arises. Some years they think there is going to be high protein content and they start buying their wheat without paying any premium. They find subsequently they are short in protein and then protein premiums will run as high as 40 or 50 cents a bushel, at least in years when prices were better than they are to-day.

This means that a lot of farmers selling early are deprived of their protein premiums and that others cash in on them possibly unduly. In other years the situation is different. They think there is going to be little protein in the country and they boost the premiums way up and then they find, when all the grain has been harvested and is ready for market that they were mistaken, and then all of a sudden protein premiums are much reduced and sometimes absolutely cut off. The discontinuance of protein premiums in some States in some seasons has actually thrown many farmer-owned elevator companies into bankruptcy because they had bought the high protein wheat on the theory that the premiums would continue.

So I say the main purpose of the bill is to get the information to determine what the facts are so that there can be some stability in these protein premiums; intelligent information that will make it possible for the trade, under the general law of supply and demand, to fix reasonable protein values.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I notice in section 2 there is language which will permit the Secretary to establish, operate, and maintain laboratories without requiring that the States cooperate in the cost of such establishment, maintenance, and operation. Is it the gentleman's idea that the Secretary should have such broad authority and that there should be no requirement for the States, who are really the ones interested, to participate in the cost?

Mr. BURTNESS. This is not a matter of State work at all in so far as the general surveys are concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. If it is not a matter for State work, why does the language of the bill make it cooperative?

Mr. LEAVITT. That is with respect to the laboratories. My State, for example, has quite a few State laboratories that cost the Federal Government nothing. This would allow cooperation between the Federal Government and the States in securing the necessary information, the dissemination of which generally over the country would be made possible through the Federal Government.

Mr. BURTNESS. What they have in mind is particularly cooperation with the laboratory in the land-grant agricultural colleges of the country which are in a way Federal and State colleges.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. The bill goes further than requiring cooperation, it provides that if the cooperation does not seem to be desirable and can not be obtained the Secretary is authorized to establish laboratories.

Mr. BURTNESS. It leaves that to the discretion of the Secretary.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. But it would be permitted without requiring States to participate.

Mr. HOPE. There are some States in the eastern part of the country that grow a great deal of wheat where the protein content has been given no attention. Indiana, in the gentleman's own State, makes no provision for high-protein wheat, but there is a premium paid for low-protein wheat. The biscuit and pastry men pay a premium for low-protein wheat, and it is thought that some of these might be in a position to cooperate because they do not have State laboratories, and there ought to be a laboratory for the soft-wheat section.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why not include other agricultural products—cotton, sugar beets—why favor the wheat farmer and leave out farmers for all the year?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and I want to know just one thing. If this is simply for laboratory research work, there is sufficient law now which would authorize the Department of Agriculture to carry on such research work. Obviously, this bill provides for something else. One purpose was frankly stated by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT] in reply to an inquiry made by the gentleman from Arizona, that many of the States have such laboratories and we are now embarking on a new 50-50 proposition to cooperate with the States. That is one reason. If it is only required for work in the laboratory, we have an appropriation of \$88,000,000, excluding \$125,000,000 for roads, in the agricultural bill, and there are facilities there to provide for the research-laboratory work.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. KETCHAM. It seems to me that the reason for the legislation is plain. You can readily understand that in the laboratories set up—I am not a chemist, but the standards set up in the various laboratories would differ as chemists differ. Now, it is desired by this bill to have one general standard, because gentlemen can see that if there is a difference between the protein content in North Dakota and Minnesota in one year, naturally the gentlemen in charge of the respective laboratories desire that there shall be but one standard.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman makes an intelligent speech, as he always does. But what we need is a clearing-house standard. That being so, the Department of Agriculture can do it without this additional legislation; and surely the bill that would make \$75,000 mandatory—

Mr. BURTNESS. The gentleman overlooks the most important part of the bill, and that is to make a survey as to protein content of wheat generally. The first line in section 2 authorizes the Secretary to make a survey and to conduct a research, and the Bureau of Economics of the Agricultural Department desires this legislation.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Are there different methods of ascertaining the protein content of wheat and other farm crops and do the laboratories employ different methods, or is there one standard method for the determination of protein content?

Mr. BURTNESS. I have forgotten the exact nature of different protein tests. In general they are distinguished from the gluten test. I am not a chemist. I think they are more and more using the same method to determine protein content, but one of the largest milling industries in the country has for its own use continued to use the gluten test instead of the protein test for its own use.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. If there is one generally accepted method for ascertaining the protein content, and if this method is applied in those areas where there exists a necessity for such determination, then all that is required to ascertain the average protein content for any year is simply a mathematical computation made here in Washington of the results obtained in the various laboratories.

Mr. BURTNESS. But that is not the information desired, for it would come too late to stabilize premiums throughout the season.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Then what is the information desired?

Mr. BURTNESS. Assume we are going into the 1931 marketing season for wheat. First, the people down in Oklahoma start cutting their wheat. At that time one of the questions that every miller will be interested in and that every intelligent producer who has watched the development of information with reference to protein during the last 10 or 15 years will be interested in is how is the 1931 crop going to turn out with reference to protein. Every one is interested in trying to get some samples just as early as possible of the wheat as soon as it has matured enough so that its protein content can be determined. They want to know, first, what is the protein content of wheat in Oklahoma, and they want to know before the wheat starts going to market, if possible, and then the same information is desired in Texas, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, southern Minnesota, and finally in North Dakota and Montana. We come in at the tail end, of course, up in the spring-wheat area. In other words, all interested persons want a general picture to determine whether there is going to be more protein in the United States than our domestic millers need, or less. It needs cooperation upon the part of the agricultural colleges, farm agents, and others to go out and gather in samples, and so forth, so as to get enough tests made here and there throughout the country so that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics can get a general picture of it, and then give that general picture to the country as a whole. It is not a question of making tests for individuals, for the hundreds of thousands of wheat farmers.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I understand that perfectly. What you want is a determination of the protein content of the crop.

Mr. BURTNESS. As a whole.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. As a whole.

Mr. BURTNESS. As early as possible.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. It would seem to me that, if there is a necessity in any and all geographical areas in this country to determine the protein content of wheat, the tests can be made there; and that then by simply taking all of the tests and computing the average protein content of the crop the information sought can be obtained by a mathematician here in Washington, without authorizing what this bill further proposes shall be done, namely, the establishment of laboratories wherever the Secretary may consider it to be wise, anywhere in the United States, for conducting these tests.

Mr. BURTNESS. They may have tests made wherever laboratories are available, but that may not prove sufficient; hence discretion is given to the Secretary of Agriculture to establish laboratories if needed.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Agriculture has submitted no report approving this legislation. This is for the purpose of helping some individual grower or some man who stores wheat to sell his product, because he has a certain protein content which will give him an advantage. Why is not he able to show to the purchaser that his wheat has that advantage without asking the Federal Government to analyze it?

Mr. BURTNESS. But this is not for the purpose of giving information to an individual as to the exact content of his crop but primarily for a general survey.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION, PARIS, FRANCE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was House Joint Resolution 416, to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the expenses of participation by the United States in the International Exposition of Colonial and Overseas Countries, to be held at Paris, France, in 1931.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Within six blocks of this Capitol every day there is a bread line, people standing in line to get food, whose families are starving. That condition exists, though to a greater ex-

tent, in practically every big city in the United States. The purpose of increasing this appropriation from \$250,000 to \$300,000 is given in the letter by Mr. Slemp. Thinking of all the money that he can spend on this trip, and being asked to itemize it, he can only aggregate some \$278,000, which is just \$28,000 more than the appropriation already made, but they ask for \$50,000. If he will scale downward in the same proportion that he has attempted to scale upward, he can probably do it on the present appropriation.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the gentleman from Texas and of other Members of the House to the international character of these exhibitions and to the appropriations that are being made by other countries. Italy is spending three and one-half million lire. Holland, when we reduce the appropriation to dollars, is spending \$480,000; Portugal, \$240,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Would the gentleman reduce the three and one-half million lire to dollars?

Mr. TEMPLE. I shall come back to that afterwards. Portugal, \$240,000; Indo-China, \$1,120,000; French West Africa, \$520,000; Madagascar, to date, \$400,000; Morocco, \$280,000; Algeria, \$240,000; Tunisia, \$240,000; African Mandatory, \$180,000; France, to start with, 6,000,000 francs, with an additional 8,000,000 francs, and with an estimate of 6,000,000 francs more before the exposition is closed.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania well knows that the dollar of some of those countries that he has named is worth about one-fifth of what our dollar is.

Mr. TEMPLE. I think when their currency is reduced to American dollars it means just the same as if the dollars were American dollars in the first place.

Mr. BLANTON. Was it reduced to the value of our American dollar?

Mr. TEMPLE. So I understand. That is the testimony of Mr. Slemp, the commissioner general for the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. But Mr. Slemp, the gentleman knows, in his letter gives us a detailed and itemized report of the extra money he needs. He has itemized it, and he shows that he needs only \$85,000 for the building in round numbers; \$93,000 for the exhibits. The other he puts in as incidentals, and so on, but even with his new estimate, which asks for only \$278,000, of which \$250,000 has already been allowed, why come in and ask for \$50,000 when he says he needs only \$28,000 additional?

Mr. TEMPLE. All the personnel from the Territories has been omitted from his estimate. It is not certain whether the Philippine Islands, Hawaii, Samoa, Panama, Guam, or Alaska will pay their own personnel, and so he had a margin to cover such items. If the Philippines and Alaska and Hawaii and Samoa pay their own personnel and if certain other items are similarly cared for, he will not need the additional money. If they do not, that margin will be needed.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask this question: There are over 5,000,000 men that we know of in the United States who are without work and their families are starving, and the President of the United States has just appointed a committee of 75 prominent men to raise \$10,000,000 to try to feed our people. Does the gentleman not think that not only the United States but all these other countries should put off this exposition until such time as the countries can recover economically and our people can get back to work and feed their families? I think we ought to save all of this money for the present.

Mr. TEMPLE. I would like to say two things in answer to the gentleman: First, we are committed to this by an appropriation of \$250,000 already, and rather than see the thing fizzle I would like to make the additional appropriation.

Mr. BLANTON. Why not give this \$50,000 to our food relief for our own people in the United States who are suffering? There are people who are suffering in foreign lands

who need their exposition money as badly as they are suffering in our land.

Mr. TEMPLE. Secondly, an appropriation of \$50,000 for this purpose will not interfere in the least with any appropriation that may be made for feeding the hungry in this country.

Mr. BLANTON. Right now the attempted appropriation of \$25,000,000 to feed starving people is being held up by the gentleman's administration.

Mr. TEMPLE. Not on the ground that we do not have the money.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly, I shall allow my friend to speak, but eventually I intend to object.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. If the gentleman can not be dissuaded I will not make any statement at this time.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11967) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Illinois.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I object, because I do not think we need any more district judges right now in Illinois.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Are there any further objections? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional judge of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLAIM OF POLISH GOVERNMENT FOR COMMUNITY OF RZECZYCHANY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12037) authorizing the payment of a claim presented by the Polish Government for the reimbursement of certain expenditures incurred by the community authorities of Rzechyczany, Poland, to which place an insane alien was erroneously deported.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object to this bill, but I want to call the attention of this House to the fact that this bill involves a real tragedy of life.

Can you imagine a human being in this country recorded, identified according to the immigration officials, sent all the way back to Poland to be delivered to his father and when he gets there they find they have deported the wrong man? Why, Mr. Speaker, not even in the Dark Ages was such human torture inflicted on a human being. I can not imagine this unfortunate man being taken, identified, if you please, and sent all the way to Poland in shackles as an insane person and then they found the man they thought he was was working honestly out in Chicago somewhere.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I notice, however, that this bill is for the relief of the Polish Government and not for the man.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Because they are sending him back.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. He is just going to be rewarded with a trip? There is no relief for him? It is for the foreign government?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I think he has got a claim against the Government. Does not the gentleman from New York think so?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. He has more than that.

Mr. TEMPLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. TEMPLE. The man who was deported to Poland was an insane man.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. True.

Mr. TEMPLE. If it was necessary to put him in shackles, and I do not know that it was, then the fact that he was not the man they thought he was did not make him any the less insane. The tragedy was that the man's father had been informed that his son was insane. When the man reached him he did not recognize him as his son and learned afterwards that the son was not insane but was quietly at his work in Chicago. Of course, he refused to receive the man that he knew nothing about, and the poor authorities of the city of Rzechyczany took care of him while he was there. A bill has been presented to the United States, and this that we are now considering is to authorize an appropriation to reimburse that town for taking care of the man that we sent over there through a blunder of our immigration authorities.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I will grant all the gentleman says, but does not the gentleman agree that an unfortunate insane man, an inmate of an asylum, is entitled to sufficient protection so that he will not be erroneously deported thousands of miles?

Mr. TEMPLE. He certainly is.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I have had some experience with how these poor unfortunate creatures are deported. I have served in the Immigration Service.

Mr. TEMPLE. I hope the gentleman never made any mistakes like this when he was in that service.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. No, indeed. But they are put in a little room down in the hold of the ship because they are marked "Insane." They go into shackles when they arrive on the continent, and I say it is a human tragedy that any such blunder should have been committed.

Mr. TEMPLE. I was merely wishing to make a little plainer exactly the nature of the tragedy.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I understand that, but it was unpardonable.

Mr. TEMPLE. It was a blunder which, I may say, is humiliating to all of us, and the sooner we can compensate those people for the unnecessary expense we put upon them the better. We ought to pass the bill.

Mr. HOOPER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania how long ago this incident occurred. I have not the report before me. Was it within the last year or two?

Mr. TEMPLE. Nineteen hundred and twenty-seven.

Mr. HOOPER. It is not one of these claims, then, that are held against this Government by citizens of foreign countries that have been kicking around the House of Representatives for the last 10 or 12 years?

Mr. TEMPLE. I would like to say to the gentleman from Michigan that these matters do not kick around the House of Representatives. The Committee on Foreign Affairs takes care of them speedily. This report came to the committee on April 28, 1930, a bill was introduced and a report was made on April 30, but it was not reached before we adjourned.

Mr. HOOPER. I was not raising any question about the gentleman's action or the action of his committee, but there are honest claims of citizens of foreign countries here that have time after time and year after year come before this House on the Consent Calendar and been arbitrarily rejected. I wanted to know whether this was one of that kind of claim or whether it was a comparatively recent case.

Mr. TEMPLE. The man was deported September 13, 1927. How long it has taken for the bureau of the Government to make the investigation and learn that it was an error I do not know, but the matter came to the Committee on Foreign Affairs on April 28 last, and it was reported to the House on April 30, but we never got to it before we adjourned.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if it is

not a fact that the United States Government was acting with good intentions when it deported this man?

Mr. TEMPLE. Oh, yes.

Mr. BLANTON. It thought it was doing something for the benefit of the man and his father.

Mr. TEMPLE. But it blundered.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman from New York would throw such a fit over this kind of a blunder, I wonder what he would do if he would investigate some of these cases out at St. Elizabeths right now, where there are not only insane men but sane men kept behind bars.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The same attitude would apply. I think that these unfortunates who are designated as insane require more protection than anyone else.

Mr. BLANTON. But charity begins at home. We ought to begin right here in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I thought the gentleman from Texas was attending to that.

Mr. BLANTON. No; I have done my share of it and have quit it now. I brought it to the attention of Congress and presented the detailed evidence before committees, and thus my duty was performed.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not if the distinguished chairman of the committee will inform me as to how this name in Poland is pronounced. [Laughter.]

Mr. TEMPLE. My information is that the name, in spite of its peculiar spelling, is very easily pronounced. I have been told it is pronounced Rzeczeczany. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$152.35 to be paid to the Polish Government for the reimbursement of certain expenditures incurred by the community authorities of Rzeczeczany, Poland, to which place an insane alien was erroneously deported.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CLAIM OF THE DANISH MOTOR SHIP "INDIEN"

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12067) for compensation to the owners of the Danish motor ship *Indien* for damages sustained as the result of a collision with the United States Coast Guard cutter *Shawnee* at San Francisco on April 5, 1925.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, here are two bills coming together. In this case the Coast Guard cutter collided with another ship; but the other ship was at anchor at her pier; and in the next bill we have the unlawful detention of a ship by another Coast Guard cutter, resulting in damages. So I just want to add this to your general cost of prohibition. I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania is ready to say the steering gear was out of order, but I will say that a collision of this kind requires a great deal of explaining, just the same as the conduct of the crew in the next bill.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Then, why not charge it to booze?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. That is exactly what I am trying to do.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. And that is what we are trying to stop in this country.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Perhaps they consumed the evidence.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in those two bills, as well as in the previous bill, it is the interest of a foreign government that is to be cared for. Now, when the boats of citizens of this country are damaged by such collisions or citizens are damaged, their claims are allowed to kick around the House of Representatives for 8 or 10 years before the claims are paid, if they are paid at all.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I understand that the claims of American nationals are settled more rapidly than the claims of citizens of foreign countries.

Mr. TEMPLE. I wish to say that there is no evidence and there is no hint whatever in the testimony presented to the committee that this particular case had anything to do with liquor.

The investigation was made by the Coast Guard authorities, and they admit the collision was the fault of the United States in this way; not the fault, they say, of anyone on board the ship, but the result of defects in the reversing machinery.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. If the gentleman will permit me, if I walk out of this room and instead of hitting the door I hit that picture [indicating], the gentleman is going to have some suspicion as to what I have been doing.

Mr. TEMPLE. I might inquire why, but the reason why is given in this particular case. An investigation, not by the captain of the vessel but by the Coast Guard commander of the entire district, reports that the reversing gear of the vessel would not operate. There was some defect in the machinery, and, of course, we are responsible on that account. The next case, however, is one on which the gentleman may make his booze speech.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I will make it on this one, too.

Mr. HOOPER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from New York a question. The gentleman from New York just said, in response to a question of his colleague from New York, that he conceded that the claims of American nationals were settled with greater celerity here than the claims of foreign nationals—

Mr. LaGUARDIA. No; the gentleman misunderstood me. I said claims of American nationals against foreign governments are settled, I think, more expeditiously than the claims of foreign nationals against this Government.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. If the gentleman will yield; that is not what I had in mind. I said that these claims are for the benefit of foreign governments, and I said that such claims appear to be settled more expeditiously than similar claims of American citizens against our own Government.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Oh, I understand.

Mr. HOOPER. Is it not true, as a matter of common experience here, that the claims of American nationals are settled much more quickly here than the claims of foreign nationals against the United States?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I will say that when a claim has been conceded by our State Department, which has had contacts with the foreign government concerned, it is our moral duty, if not a greater responsibility, to expedite the recognition of such a claim.

Mr. HOOPER. Has not the gentleman, from his long and valuable experience here, found it is very difficult to get the just claim of a foreign national through the House when it is on this calendar?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. There was a bill objected to here recently that has been on the calendar for years, although we acknowledged liability and accepted the claim. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. HOOPER. The gentleman does not like that policy, does he?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. No; I do not.

Mr. COLE. This claim has been pending for six years.

Mr. TEMPLE. But I would like to say to the gentleman that it was not brought to the attention of the Foreign Affairs Committee until April, 1930.

Mr. COLE. The delay was not in our committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to pay to the Danish Government, as an act of grace and without reference to the question of liability therefor, the sum of \$3,288.52 as full compensation to the owners of the Danish motor ship *Indien* for damages sustained as the result of a collision with the United States Coast Guard cutter *Shawnee* at San Francisco on April 5, 1925; and there is hereby authorized to

be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sufficient sum to carry out the purpose of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE NORWEGIAN SHIP "TAMPEN"

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12352) to authorize the payment of an indemnity to the Norwegian Government in full and final satisfaction of all claims arising as a result of the detention of the Norwegian steamer *Tampen* by the United States Coast Guard in June, 1925.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to pay to the Norwegian Government, as an act of grace and without reference to the question of legal liability, the sum of \$8,765 in full and final settlement of all claims for reimbursement on account of losses sustained by reason of the detention of the Norwegian steamer *Tampen* by the United States Coast Guard during June, 1925; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sufficient sum to carry out the purpose of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ATTENDANCE OF THE ARMY BAND AT THE CONFEDERATE VETERANS' REUNION AT MONTGOMERY, ALA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14573) authorizing the attendance of the Army Band at the Confederate Veterans' Reunion to be held at Montgomery, Ala.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, now is the time for the gentleman from Texas to make his unemployment speech. Here we provide for sending the Army Band down to the annual Confederate Veterans' reunion at Montgomery, Ala. Are there no musicians down there?

Mr. HILL of Alabama. None that can take the place of these men.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. The music is to take the place of booze.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes; how about that, I will ask the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. HILL of Alabama. We need this band down there for this reunion, and it has been the custom of the Government to send one of the service bands to this reunion.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. But we have musicians walking the streets and last year I objected, and finally, I think, a bill was passed under suspension of the rules. Anyhow, I know I was overruled. I think, Mr. Speaker, where we have musicians out of employment, we should not take either the Marine Band or the Navy Band or the Army Band or any band under the Government, the members of which are on a salary, getting three square meals a day, and have them compete with private musicians.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Let me suggest to the gentleman that this is an unusual situation.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Certainly, it is.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. So far as I know there are no musicians out of jobs in the town of Montgomery, Ala., who could adequately substitute for this band.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. There are plenty of them here in Washington.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. That may be true, but I know of no one who has the money to transport those musicians to Montgomery, pay their railroad fare down there and their salaries too. I hope the gentleman will not object. This is a custom that has been established for some time and the Government has always followed this custom in the past.

Mr. JENKINS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Certainly.

Mr. JENKINS. I notice this bill provides that these musicians are to be paid \$5 a day in addition to their expenses and their present rate of pay.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. No; that \$5 is simply to take care of their actual expenses.

Mr. JENKINS. I do not read the bill in that way.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Either the language of the bill is not clear or the gentleman has not read it carefully. The language of the bill is:

Not to exceed \$5 per day each for actual living expenses while on this detail.

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; and read the rest of it:

And that the payment of such expenses shall be in addition to the pay and allowances to which members of the United States Army Band would be entitled while serving at their permanent stations.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Of course, you do not deduct anything from their regular pay because you send them on this particular mission.

Mr. JENKINS. No; I do not want to deduct anything, but I do not believe that these men when they get their base pay and their expenses while on this trip ought to have \$5 a day in addition.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. The \$5 a day is simply to take care of their expenses in providing their meals and sleeping quarters while on the trip.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I wish that some Members on that side of the aisle would make objection and not leave it wholly to me.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. This bill follows the form used in the past of allowing \$5 a day for three meals a day and for sleeping quarters.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman asked me to object. Whether I am in the House 1 day or 25 years I shall never object to any proposal to send the Government band to any national meeting of any soldiers' organization that ever fought for their flag.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. For that flag? This is a Confederate organization.

Mr. BLANTON. But their flag was just as dear to them as any other flag ever was to any other patriotic soldier.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. But the gentleman made the statement that he would never object to furnishing a band for an organization who fought for "that flag."

Mr. BLANTON. I meant their flag which they were patriotically following. I would not object to an organization that fought for any flag which is just as dear to them as that flag.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AUTHORIZING A DEPARTMENT TO FURNISH MATERIAL, WORK, AND SERVICES FOR ANOTHER DEPARTMENT

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10199) authorizing any executive department or independent establishment to do work for any other executive department or independent establishment and prescribing the method of payment therefor.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I will.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. The only purpose of this bill is to permit one department to furnish material, labor, and services for another department at the request of that department when not equipped to perform the services for itself. We already have a law permitting the Navy Department to do work for other departments. We are trying to rewrite the law so that it will apply to all departments and provide a uniform practice through the entire service. It will mean the saving of hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it the purpose to give authority so that a department can call on any activity of the Govern-

ment for the performance of work which now requires bids from private contractors?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. No; not that.

Mr. STAFFORD. The language is broad enough to cover that. If the Navy is engaged in the manufacture of a certain line of activity like motor or Diesel engines and a department needs that service, instead of calling on private contractors they can call on another department of the Government. Do you mean to socialize the Government and have the Government produce everything?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. That is not the purpose of the bill. A department of the Government may need statistical information, or certain scientific data, or highly specialized services which another department is equipped to furnish. There is no need of its going to work and gathering it for itself when another department has that information. Such department can be called on to do the work. We propose where facilities are available in one department to allow another department to utilize them when they can be used to advantage.

An instance is where the Navy Department has inspectors who have specialized on determining the character of certain materials. The Treasury, which is engaged in construction work, orders materials upon specifications. Why should not the Treasury have the right to go to the Navy Department and ask its specialists to determine whether the materials comply with the specifications?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Under this bill the Prohibition Department, if it desired, could request the services of stenographers and clerks in the Department of Agriculture to go out and aid the Prohibition Service.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. The gentleman knows that this bill does not authorize anything of the kind. No department can call upon any other department for its personnel.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman offer an amendment putting in a proviso to that effect, because the word "service" is broad and sweeping?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

UNCOMPAGRE RECLAMATION PROJECT, COLORADO

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 14916) for the relief of the Uncompahgre reclamation project, Colorado, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. Before the Clerk reports the bill the Chair desires to make this observation: This bill is on the Private Calendar. It is not the custom of the Chair as a rule to recognize a Member to move to suspend the rules and pass bills on the Private Calendar. However, this differs very substantially from most such bills. As the Chair understands it, it deals with a very large project, and a very large number of people are interested in it. The Government itself is interested in it according to the information the Chair received from the Secretary. The Clerk will report the bill as amended.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, may I say further that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] called my attention this morning to this bill and I had the privilege of examining the bill at that time. I said then that I thought the bill could properly be on the Public Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is properly on the Private Calendar. It deals with only one project, but it is a large one, and there is great interest both on the part of the Government and a large number of people. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That if the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users' Association shall, under the contract of April 8, 1927, between the United States and the association, on or before January 1, 1932, take over the operation, maintenance, and control of the entire Uncompahgre reclamation project, Colorado, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to enter into an amendatory contract with the said association which shall provide as follows:

First. All construction and operation and maintenance charges (exclusive of any operation and maintenance charges required to be paid by the association for the operation and maintenance of the project for the calendar year 1930) that were or shall be due and unpaid under said contract of 1927 on December 31, 1930, including the then unpaid deferred charges under articles 17 (b) and (d) of said contract (without interest and penalties on such deferred accounts) and the construction charge that becomes due on December 1, 1931, under said contract, may be included in and made payable as part of the project supplemental construction charge hereinafter mentioned. Interest and penalties heretofore paid on deferred charges under articles 17 (b) and (d) shall be remitted and credited against the association's obligation for supplemental construction.

Second. During each of the years 1932 to 1937, both inclusive, the association shall have the right to expend for the construction of a drainage system such portion of the construction charge payable to the United States under said contract of 1927, as said association may consider necessary and as may be provided for by plans prepared by the association and approved by or on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior, the moneys so expended to be secured from construction charge assessments to be made to meet the regular construction charge installments that become due and payable under the said contract of 1927 on December 1 of the years 1931 to 1936, inclusive. The amounts so expended by the association for drainage each calendar year from December 1 to November 30 for six years beginning with December 1, 1931, shall be credited to the annual construction charge that becomes due annually on December 1 of each year during the period of 1932 to 1937, both inclusive, the payment of the construction charges for which it is so substituted being in each case postponed to be paid later as a part of the supplemental construction charges authorized in item 3 hereof. Should the amounts so expended and credited annually be less than the annual construction charge for the years 1932 to 1937, both inclusive, the balance of each year's charge shall be payable to the United States in accordance with the contract of 1927.

Third. The amounts so expended and credited, the amounts postponed under the provisions of item 1 hereof, and any amounts of primary construction charges applicable to productive lands that shall not have become due and payable by the association under the contract of 1927, on or before December 1, 1931, shall be considered and defined as the project supplemental construction charge and shall be made payable by the association in annual installments of \$85,000, the first installment of such supplemental construction charges to be payable on December 1, 1932, and a like installment on December 1 of each subsequent year until the total of the supplemental construction charge indebtedness is reduced to \$85,000 or less, which remaining amount shall then be made payable as the last installment on December 1 of the calendar year next following the year in which the indebtedness is so reduced; and

Fourth. No stock assessment levied by the association to raise payments due the Government on construction need be increased more than 15 per cent of the normal yearly per irrigable acre construction installment as provided in section 17 of the contract of April 8, 1927, to meet deficits or estimated deficits due to the failure of some of the association's stockholders to pay their assessments when due, any resulting delinquencies as established after foreclosure of maximum assessment liens in meeting installments of charges due the United States from the association to be paid as a part of the supplemental construction charge authorized in item (3) hereof.

Sec. 2. It shall be provided as a condition subsequent that said contract shall terminate and be annulled unless (1) the General Assembly of the State of Colorado at its twenty-eighth session enacts legislation, which becomes effective (a) authorizing a water users' association to be incorporated for a term of at least 75 years, and (b) amending chapter 76 of Colorado Session Laws, 1929, so as to permit the decree in proceedings to confirm a contract between such association and the United States to constitute as against parties defendant, including owners, lienors, and mortgagees of land in the district, an amendment of existing water-right contracts with individual landowners in the district, so far as the contract confirmed is inconsistent with such individual contracts; (2) the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users' Association thereupon extends its term of incorporation for at least 75 years from the date of such amendment of its articles; and (3) the association secures promptly a confirmatory decree, confirming such proposed contract with the United States under said amendment of chapter 76 of the Session Laws of Colorado, 1929.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin to 20 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this bill provides for several very important matters. First, it permits the United States to transfer the

Uncompahgre project to the water users for their operation and maintenance, dispensing with the necessity for further appropriations from the reclamation fund for that purpose. Second, it contains provisions for very necessary drainage construction to be done by the water users. Third, it makes provision for the adjustment of water-right charges on the project. Fourth, it fixes a definite annual liability of the water users. Fifth, it requires definite legislation by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, and some other less important matters that are a part of a coordinated plan. Some of the water users of the project are now delinquent in the payment of water-right charges to such an extent that under the present law they will not be entitled to the delivery of water during the present year unless this legislation is enacted prior to the opening of the irrigation season. Prompt action on the bill is therefore of vital importance. The irrigation season starts early in the spring, and it is imperatively necessary that this bill shall become a law before that time.

A large part of the land under this project has gone to seep and has become utterly unproductive. All that water-logged land must be drained before it will ever produce anything. That means many large canals and ditches and a vast expense and many years time to reclaim that land. Furthermore, the 6-mile tunnel that takes the water from the Gunnison River and turns it over into this valley must some time be repaired and partially rebuilt, and enlarged. That probably will cost possibly \$400,000 or \$500,000 more, and the drainage may cost that much. The Government does not want to expend any more money on this project, and by this bill turns it over to the water users' association to control and operate it hereafter. The Government does not release any claim or lien upon that land, however. The Government holds a first lien or mortgage for several million dollars on all of the land under the project. There are about 90,000 acres of land all told under this project. But all that land is not productive. The Government is not taking any chances on this measure at all. In other words, it is a bill for the relief of Uncle Sam as well as for the relief of the water users. The plan embodied in this bill is recommended after exhaustive and long and most careful consideration by the Secretary of the Interior, the Bureau of Reclamation, the governor and other officials of Colorado, the president of the Agricultural College, the officials of the Water Users Association, and many other prominent citizens. The report of all those people and officials as a coordinating committee is as follows:

REPORT OF THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON THE UNCOMPAGHGRE PROJECT

HON. WILLIAM H. ADAMS,
Governor of Colorado.

HON. ELWOOD MEAD,
Commissioner of Reclamation.

GENTLEMEN: Your committee appointed to investigate conditions on and affecting the Uncompahgre reclamation project in Montrose and Delta Counties, Colo., and to make recommendations for the improvement of conditions under the project, have made as careful and thorough a study of the problems presented as time and circumstances permitted and beg leave to report as follows:

1. In addition to much valuable information secured by correspondence and from official records, we have visited the project, inspected a large part of the area thereunder, heard the testimony of many competent witnesses, and received the formal requests of the board of directors of the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users' Association for such relief as they deem important in the restoration of better economic and agricultural conditions on the project. We are impressed with the integrity and sincerity of the water users in their expressions of a desire to work amicably with Federal and State agencies for the betterment of their condition, and with the intelligent and forceful manner in which their problems were presented to this committee.

2. It is our conclusion that the problems of the farmers under the project are threefold and may be described as "general," "local," and "contractual." Those classed as "general" may be said to include the agricultural depression existing over the entire country, with a consequent decline in land values and actual loss from farm operations; those classed as "local" include county and school district taxes, unduly high interest rates, feeding and pasture limitations, marketing difficulties, transportation costs, tenant farming and nonresident ownership, soil, and irrigation conditions which contribute toward seepage, plant disease, and other conditions to be found in whole or in part in other sections of the country; those classed as "contractual" include the

"blanket mortgage," or joint liability, and the accumulation of charges, with interest, against each acre of land within the project.

3. Passing those problems classed as "general" because they are not susceptible to relief except by the gradual but certain economic readjustment of the Nation and the world, we believe that as to those classed as "local" much may be accomplished by careful surveys of local public needs and the limitation of tax levies to meet the demands which modern living and transportation conditions impose upon rural communities in America; by a more encouraging psychology among the individuals and groups controlling financial resources, so that profitable farming and stock feeding may be possible at reasonable interest charges; by the elimination of pessimism and a low morale on the part of the landowners, farmers, and business men within the project, and by the cooperation of all local, State, and Federal agencies which may aid in studying and relieving the adverse conditions which now tend to add to farming under the project difficulties not common to agriculture in other sections of the West.

4. As to those problems classed as "contractual," our conclusions are as follows:

That the blanket mortgage or joint liability is written into the reclamation law, is a feature of every existing reclamation project, and can not be modified or removed from the contract. Under the law future payments for construction charges must be completed within the period of 40 years from the date of public notice.

5. We recommend that the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users' Association take over the care, operation, and maintenance of the whole project on January 1, 1931, believing that by such action the morale of the landowners, farmers, and business men under the project will be materially improved; that much of the dissatisfaction now voiced will be eliminated and that the project will go forward with the optimism which its soil, climate, and water resources justify.

6. We recommend that by such congressional action as may be necessary all construction and operation and maintenance charges unpaid on December 31, 1930, including those deferred under the contract of April 8, 1927, shall be carried forward as supplemental construction charges to the end of the present repayment period (December 1, 1961) for construction charges as provided in the contract of April 8, 1927, and to be paid thereafter at the same rate and on the same annual due dates that now govern the payment of the original construction charges, and that the amount heretofore paid into the reclamation fund by water users under the project as interest on deferred payments be credited to the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users' Association.

7. We urge that the Department of the Interior permit the water users through their association to make such annual expenditures not in excess of \$500,000, in the aggregate, for drainage upon the project as may seem advisable and as will add to the productivity, repaying ability, and general progress of the project, upon plans approved by the Bureau of Reclamation; such expenditures to be made by the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users' Association from construction charges collected by it annually from the water users, and the amount so expended each year to be carried as supplemental construction charges, payable to the Bureau of Reclamation, without interest, at the end of the present repayment (December 1, 1961), for construction charges as provided in the contract of April 8, 1927, and to be paid thereafter at the same rate and on the same annual due dates that now govern the payment of the original construction charges.

8. We recommend that the contract of April 8, 1927, be amended in such particulars as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing recommendations.

9. Such advice as we have been able to secure convinces us that any effort to secure congressional appropriations for relining the Gunnison Tunnel or constructing the proposed Taylor Park Reservoir will be fruitless and will endanger other relief measures which now seem possible of attainment, so we do not recommend efforts to secure public funds for those purposes at this time. The drainage problem we believe is adequately met by the recommendations in paragraph 7, and the relining of the tunnel and the construction of the proposed reservoir, we believe, are not emergent and, in the light of certain and definite danger to the other and more urgent phases of relief outlined in this report, may well await future and more timely action.

10. We find it a practical impossibility to secure a readjustment of the provisions of the contract of April 8, 1927, so as to fix the maximum annual charge per acre for construction cost repayments at \$1 or any other definite and certain amount which would interfere with the present law requiring repayment in 40 years, but we believe that if the recommendations herein contained as to transfer of control of the project to the association, the postponement of charges as recommended in paragraph 6 hereof and the institution of a definite drainage program as outlined in paragraph 7 hereof are adopted by the Department of the Interior and the association, such action will result in far greater measures for the reestablishment of confidence and the restoration of a wholesome morale than could be accomplished by a limitation of repayment liabilities.

11. We urge the sympathetic cooperation of all State departments and service agencies with the water users on the project in their effort to improve their economic condition, and we recommend cooperation between the Colorado Agricultural College, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of Reclamation to the end that some one of outstanding ability in economics and agriculture may be assigned to the definite task

of aiding those under the project in working out problems of that character which we believe to be of paramount importance to the future of the project.

CHARLES A. LORY, *Chairman*.
WILLIAM P. DALE.
R. F. WALTER.
GEORGE W. BRUCE.
EDWARD D. FOSTER.

DENVER, COLO., September 13, 1930.

That committee held many meetings and made a thorough investigation of this entire situation and this bill is the result, prepared by the Interior Department as an Administration bill. It is not my bill, or the water users' bill. It is the bill of the Secretary of the Interior which he prepared and has sent up to the House and Senate and is now very earnestly asking Congress to pass it and authorize him to make a contract with the water users whereby it will be possible for those people to so handle the project that they can make a living and something for their work and enable them to repay the Federal Government for its outlay on it. All the money hereafter advanced for the purpose of drainage or any other improvement, these water users will have to advance themselves. There is a provision in the bill that they will be allowed to contribute by assessment upon themselves \$85,000 a year for the next five years, and instead of paying that into the Federal Treasury on construction charges they are allowed to expend it on the necessary drainage, which makes the security of Uncle Sam that much better. Then the Government of the United States takes that payment at the end of the 30 years' period allowed under the law for all those reclamation projects at the present time.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. McFADDEN. How many owners and how many tenants are there on this particular property?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I can not tell the gentleman. I understand something like 900 people have during recent years left the project because they could not make a living on it. The charges under the Government management and the penalties that have been put on these people are such that they simply can not pay them. The expense of operation and maintenance of all those canals and ditches, their distance from market, high freight rates, and other adverse conditions are so great that the present condition has got to be changed to fairer and more workable terms.

Mr. McFADDEN. How recently have these inhabitants left?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. They have been going away more or less for the last two or three years.

Mr. McFADDEN. My information shows that two years ago there were 850 farmers who owned their property there and 918 tenants. The gentleman's statement indicates that practically half those people have left.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. There are some 8,000 or 10,000 people living in Montrose and Delta Counties, which are largely included in this project. They are not all farmers, but they are all vitally affected by the success or failure of this project. I do not think all of the people who have left there were farmers or settlers. But they were dependent upon the farmers, and had to go somewhere else to make a living. Many of these settlers, water users, have become so poor that they have had to borrow money in any way possible in order to get seed, food, and other necessities in order to try to maintain themselves. Then, when their crops have failed, they have become bankrupt and could not pay and some of these lands have necessarily gone to the people that loaned them the money. The present general depression has been terrifically serious to the people on this project.

Gentlemen must bear in mind that this project is a long way from market. I have a letter from the judge of the district court of that district, in which he says they have many thousands of bushels of onions, the finest onions in the world, grown this year, and they can not sell them for 10 cents a hundred pounds, and other crops in proportion. Uncle Sam wants to salvage this project; to take some loss

and defer payments and put this project upon a practical, workable, fair, and common-sense basis. That is what the Secretary of the Interior is trying to do by this bill, and as the Representative of those people for many years in this House, I am trying to help him.

Mr. McFADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. McFADDEN. As I understand, these farmers are in default in their payment to the Government?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Some of them are; yes, sir.

Mr. McFADDEN. And this bill is canceling those payments?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; not at all. There is not a dollar cancelled.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand they are deferring those charges until 1960?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Those payments are put on to the end of the construction period charge, and then they have to pay them all back.

Mr. McFADDEN. Why should we not consider in connection with legislation like this the question of relieving farmers who had borrowed from the Federal Farm Board and can not pay their payments?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. There is nobody being relieved of payments. Some of the men who owed this money have gone. They had to go to get something to eat. But, practically speaking, the project assumes all of that debt, and they pay it back to the Government of the United States. Uncle Sam is not losing one dollar by this bill. He is making a good bargain with those people.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] such time as he may desire within the remainder of my 20 minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, this Uncompahgre project is in very serious condition financially, probably the most serious condition financially of any of the projects now in operation. It has not as yet availed itself of the opportunity of making a new contract, that was given by the legislation passed in the Smith Act a few years ago. Its difficulties have accumulated until at the present time it is in a very serious condition. I do not know that the pending bill is entirely to relieve Uncle Sam. I think he has been fairly well "relieved" before this, but the United States can not very well abandon the project since the settlers have gone in there. However, this does afford a compromise by which the people there do agree and consent to take over the project and operate it themselves and agree that hereafter the United States shall not be asked to spend a penny upon the maintenance or operation or improvement of that project. That is the first thing that commends it to me. Whatever happens to the money we have got in already, we are not to put in any more money.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman state how much money the Government has already invested in this project?

Mr. CRAMTON. Several million dollars. I should say around \$3,000,000. I think the United States has something like \$3,000,000 coming now, although I may not be accurate as to that.

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. DUNBAR. It was brought out a few minutes ago that the Government has a mortgage for \$7,000,000 on this ground, so that instead of \$3,000,000 it may be the Government has invested \$7,000,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, I may not have been accurate. I have not looked it up for a long time.

Mr. DUNBAR. This bill, if passed, will help make that Government loan more secure?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes. But I am emphasizing first that the desirable feature is that we put in no more money from the Treasury. Secondly, it does secure the signature of that district to a contract to repay us what they owe us, as far as the principal is concerned.

Their difficulties are of three varieties contributing to the present situation. First, the land is of an undesirable character because of fingers of very heavy soil and of soil that has become loaded with alkali, and so forth. It is a long, narrow, irregular project, very undesirable in shape for economic operation, and with many acres eliminated that have thrown a heavier burden on the lands that still continue.

Secondly, they have had an unfortunate leadership among the people in the project. They have had an influential leadership that has for several years fought the idea that they should ever pay the Government anything, and it is in the face of leadership of that kind that the sober good sense of the people in the project has finally brought them to the point where they are ready to sign this contract.

Third, the condition is affecting them that is affecting the country generally; that present economic conditions are such that it is practically impossible for them to meet their obligations.

So it is proposed in this bill, not to wipe off the slate any of the principal, but to carry forward into principal construction charges some of the charges past due and unpaid, and take a new start, and then in the next five years to permit them, if they will, to spend annually about \$85,000 of their own money in drainage construction, and if they do spend their money for this drainage construction, they do not have to pay that amount on the construction charges of the project generally. But, that is not wiping off these construction charges. These charges are simply postponed until the end of the present regular period of payment.

I am one who is very reluctant to be continually granting extensions, and so forth, but I know of the tremendous fight that has been carried on, the struggle that has been carried on, by the Commissioner of Reclamation, Doctor Mead, in his efforts to secure a contract with this district, in the face of this unhealthy leadership of which I spoke. As a result of his very strenuous efforts and the real underlying good common sense and fairness on the part of these settlers he has been able to work out this compromise, which I believe is very much in the interest of the Treasury as well as the people of that district, if approved by Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two minutes of my time.

Mr. McFADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. McFADDEN. This bill, as I understand, is really an admission of failure on the part of this particular project, is it not?

Mr. CRAMTON. It is an admission of great difficulties in the handling of the project. I may say that if everyone concerned had known everything they know to-day it would not have been wise, probably, to have initiated this project.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman give the House his opinion as to how many other projects are similarly situated and which Congress will be called upon to relieve of the payment of their annual charges under the reclamation law should this precedent be established?

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not know of any project remaining that is in as serious condition as this. I know of other projects where they are defaulting in their payments, some of which, I believe, could have paid if they had been properly managed or had there been sufficient desire to do so. However, I do not know of any other project that is in as serious a situation as this one.

Mr. STAFFORD. At the conclusion of the period of deferred charges, how will the Government receive back the \$7,000,000 which it has invested in the project?

Mr. CRAMTON. Under this contract they begin at a very early date to make annual payments, and the construction cost of the project, it is understood, will have been repaid by 1961, 30 years from now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. And their supplemental charges will, I understand, be met in a further period of five or six years.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice in the paper I have in my hand that two years ago there had been expended on this project \$5,378,000 and that now the total construction cost to the Government is \$6,699,000. Where does the responsibility lodge for going ahead with further expenditures on a project which is obviously one of questionable propriety?

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, when you get \$5,000,000 into a project it is essential, in the first place, to keep it alive and in running order.

Mr. STAFFORD. And keep pumping into it many millions of dollars.

Mr. CRAMTON. As I understand, there has been no construction work there since 1928.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do not think there has been very much of that work.

Mr. CRAMTON. There has been no additional construction in the last two or three years.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand, this is one of the original projects under Doctor Newell's chimerical scheme to reclaim lands that were not worth while.

Mr. CRAMTON. It was one of the earliest ones.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Colorado says this is the first experimental project under the visionary Doctor Newell, and his chimerical scheme has cost the Government not only tens of millions of dollars but hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Let me say that the Government guaranteed that the Gunnison Tunnel would be built for \$1,000,000, and people came on that land with the assurance that it would never cost them more than \$25 an acre; that was published over the land, but that tunnel has cost over \$3,000,000, it never has been completed, and it does not carry the water it was promised it would carry. It was supposed to carry 1,800 cubic feet of water per second, but it has never carried more than 850.

Mr. CRAMTON. The figures cited by the gentleman may be correct, but I do not recall any material expenditure for construction in the last two years.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM].

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I think this project was one of the very first of the many irrigation projects in the United States. It is one of two or three of the most important ones that I have had an opportunity to visit. It is in a very beautiful valley, in the center of which is Montrose. Through the range of mountains to the east comes the Gunnison River tunnel, bringing the water of that river up into the upper reaches of the valley and then swinging around the upper circle of it in a sort of horseshoelike arrangement. Then the ditches are made from that primary canal, irrigating a very fine section of the valley and, at the time I visited it, it was a great joy to go out upon those farms and see the splendid production of all kinds of farm crops. It was a delight to view it. But even at that time there was developing a very peculiar thing. I would like to have every man who is at all interested in this problem, whether he lives upon irrigated land, or a section where there are irrigation projects, or whether he lives in sections where the land has its natural rainfall, I would like to have him note this: Here originally was an area unproductive without water, and by means of this Gunnison River tunnel and the irrigation project around the valley and with these lateral ditches water in abundance was supplied. And now note what has happened. We have come to the time when there is too much water upon the project itself, and at least upon the east side of it there are acres upon acres where the water has gone down into the ground and driven up the alkali until the top of it looks like a veritable snow bank, and, of course, such land is absolutely unproductive, and the only way in

which it can be made productive is to do the very reverse of what the project was intended for, namely, to put in drainage ditches so that the effect of too much water may be overcome.

We are in a peculiar situation. We have made our investment. It turns out it is not a very good investment, and the question is, What is the best thing to do? It seems to me as though the recommendation made by the committee, and now under consideration, is the only way out. I am not taking the time now to attack the arrangement that has been made, but I am using it as an illustration of the dangers which accompany this whole irrigation proposition, which ordinarily is almost irresistible in the appeal it makes.

Undoubtedly here was one of the very finest prospects and one of the most charming places we could have for an irrigation project, and yet here we have come to-day to the point of confessing in almost sackcloth and ashes, at least in ashes, that the project has not been a success, and we are taking up the consideration of this bill not only for the welfare of the Government but also for the welfare of the citizens on the project itself.

I wish gentlemen of the House who are at all interested in this proposition would take the pains to get the report of the committee upon this measure, Report No. 2215, and turn to page 5 and read the result of the survey made by the joint authorities that have made the recommendation now before us. I am sure that would be the most eloquent testimony that could possibly be offered to the effect that we ought to be careful in launching any new irrigation projects, and, particularly, that we ought to do what I have insisted upon, in the way of putting our foot down upon any of these new surveys that promise to bring in tremendous new areas unless we know exactly what we are doing.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. That is what I was just saying to one of my colleagues a moment ago. We seem not to be able to learn by experience. We have this project before us now needing relief and next week there may be a proposal for just a survey, and we start a new project repeating all the mistakes of the past.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, may I again make my position clear upon this whole proposition. I do not want to be recorded as an enemy of all irrigation. There are many reasons why one does not want to take that position, but I do feel sure that at this time, whatever may be our location, whatever may be our natural reaction toward this particular proposition, this is the time when we ought to go slowly upon the launching of any new projects, particularly when we recognize that agriculture generally over the United States to-day is faced with the same kind of situation that is so acutely before these fine people out on this Uncompahgre project.

Mr. McFADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. McFADDEN. I would like to have the gentleman make clear that this project is not an isolated case, but is occurring in many instances where such developments have taken place.

Mr. KETCHAM. And, particularly, where care was not taken in the first place in making every possible kind of check to see whether the project itself would ultimately be a success both from an economic standpoint and from an agricultural standpoint as well.

Mr. MENGES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. MENGES. Does the gentleman know what kind of salt is coming to the surface out there?

Mr. KETCHAM. It is an alkali that comes right out of the ground and covers the top of the ground and makes it look like a veritable snowdrift right in the midst of summer.

Mr. MENGES. The gentleman does not know its composition? I was wondering whether we could go into the salt-producing business out there.

Mr. KETCHAM. I do not know, but I suspect there is not any great amount of value to it, but it certainly destroys the value of the land completely for agricultural purposes.

Mr. IRWIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. IRWIN. Will the contemplated drainage of this district meet that problem?

Mr. KETCHAM. As I understand, it will help very materially. While I was out there a great many of the settlers told me that what they absolutely needed was proper drainage.

So while this seems to be the only way out, in this particular case, and I do not want to interpose any objection, I simply wanted to use this as another opportunity to sound a note of warning and to urge that the House be very, very careful before it permits any further expansion of irrigation projects. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is now having called to its attention the seeds of bad investment occasioned by visionaries 30 years ago in utilizing Government funds on projects that could not have been defended if proper examinations and supervision had been originally made.

It is easy enough for officers of the Government to launch projects and use Uncle Sam's money where there is no accounting as to the propriety of the investment. It would have been far better 25 years ago if the Congress, instead of wet-nursing Doctor Newell, with his pet visionary projects, had made a good, businesslike survey and checked the further appropriation of Government funds.

Here to-day the Government is holding the bag to the extent of \$7,000,000. In the last two years it has spent over \$1,000,000 on further development, when any business engineer, I dare say, would have vetoed any further investment of Government funds.

I am a believer in the policy—take a gain, take a loss. We have had a loss here, and it is absolutely ridiculous for the Government to continue dumping money, more and more, into this indefensible project.

This is not the only one. There are many more. Why, we have our Army engineers on river and harbor projects making investigations as to whether a project is feasible—yes; feasible from an engineering standpoint—and instances are numerous where they make a favorable report and the Government inaugurates the project, when no business corporation would think for a moment of investing large funds in its development, because there is not enough profit to justify the expenditure.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. All over the West, Army engineers to-day are studying suggested projects and reporting not only as to the engineering feasibility but their economic feasibility, and there has been introduced in this Congress at least one bill by Senator WHEELER, of Montana, that proposes the building of a dam by the Corps of Engineers for irrigation purposes to impound 1,200,000 acre-feet of water. That by the Corps of Engineers, in the interest of irrigation, and with no provision for repayment to the Government of any of it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course, it is very easy for these engineers, honor graduates from the West Point Military Academy, who have never had any business experience, to go out and make surveys and pass upon a project from the engineering standpoint, but in this hard-headed business age of ours what is more needed than anything else is for the graduates of the Naval Academy and the graduates of the Military Academy to be sent out into the world to get some business knowledge; to get the business men's and business engineers' view of these projects, and not go ahead without any check and just spend money as they think, perhaps, it may be to the people's interest or to the interest of Uncle Sam to have it spent.

Mr. McFADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. McFADDEN. The gentleman spoke of the attitude of the former director. Is he aware of the fact that there is an aggressive administration under Doctor Mead to continue irrigation projects? An examination of the recommendations in the report to Congress indicates a lavish expenditure of funds in the future.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no disposition anywhere to curtail or stop these expenditures. We have a farmers' relief board calling on the farmers to reduce production, and Uncle Sam is being urged to appropriate additional sums for irrigation projects to make more acreage and more production possible. It is that position that I am protesting against. There is no responsibility, no accountability, it is spending money, money, money.

Mr. McFADDEN. The gentleman is aware that there is also the Columbia River Basin project that proposes to take \$350,000,000 more?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes; Uncle Sam is the good godfather for any number of projects. He is being called upon by the western representatives until there is hardly nothing left that can possibly be irrigated. As I understand the project here, with the little time I have given to its study, there is only one thing to be done—and that is for the Government to get from under.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. That is what the bill proposes to do.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let those interested in trying to make something out of it do it and not call on the Government to keep spending millions. We have lost \$7,000,000 by the irresponsibility of the engineers. The project should never have been inaugurated in the first place. Any real engineer, knowing the circumstances, would have vetoed that project originally.

More than 25 years ago, as I have had occasion to remark once before this session, it was my privilege to accompany the leader of the Republican forces at that time, Hon. James R. Mann, to an interview with Doctor Newell, then head of the Reclamation Service. I was young in years and young in the service then, but recognizing that the Reclamation Service was bankrupt, that he had gone ahead until there was no money available, I thought it proper to favor additional funds.

President Taft came to Congress and asked for a \$10,000,000 fund to be made available to try and rescue or resurrect these visionary projects, and we sank that \$10,000,000. Then we spent another \$10,000,000 later, and we kept dumping money into these projects right along; money of the taxpayers of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

TO EXPEDITE WORK ON THE FEDERAL BUILDING PROGRAM

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill with an amendment, H. R. 14040, to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to expedite work on the Federal building program authorized by the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25 1926, and acts amendatory thereof.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I demand a second.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to expedite work on the Federal building program authorized by the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926, and acts amendatory thereof, the Secretary of the

Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to obtain by contract without competition, topographical surveys of sites, test pits and borings where such sites have been selected, although title thereto may not have been vested in the United States; to limit to such number of days as he deems proper the advertising for bids for sites for public buildings; to obtain outside architectural, engineering, technical, or professional services to such extent as he deems necessary in connection with the plans and specifications for Federal buildings which have been specifically authorized to be constructed where the sites have been selected notwithstanding title to such sites may not have been vested in the United States.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, this bill is designed to expedite the work on the Federal building program.

The bill does three things: First, it empowers and authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to obtain by contracts without competition topographical surveys of sites, test pits, and borings where such sites have been selected, although title thereto may not have been vested in the United States; second, to limit to such number of days as he deems proper the advertising for bids for sites for public buildings; third, to obtain outside architectural engineering, technical, or professional services to such extent as he deems necessary in connection with the plans and specifications for Federal buildings which have been specifically authorized to be constructed where the sites have been selected, notwithstanding title to such sites may not have been vested in the United States.

Those are the three things this bill does. In the first place, it takes a great deal of time to get started to construct a building after the appropriation has been made. Under existing law you can do nothing in regard to one of these buildings until the title has vested in the United States and the Department of Justice has advised the Government that the matter is closed there. This would give them the power when they have selected a site to go ahead without waiting for the Department of Justice to approve everything and employ an engineer to make a topographical survey of the site and to make the borings into the soil to find the character of it. That would cost but a trifling sum, comparatively, but would have a tendency to speed up the work on the building. The next proposition is to limit the number of days of advertising for purchase of sites. It does not take long to do that. In some cases it is easier than in others. The last part of the bill authorizes the employment of these architects without waiting until the title to the site is vested in the Government.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. This is the same bill that was up on the Consent Calendar which we discussed this afternoon?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. And the amendment that the gentleman offers to the bill is to strike out the matter that was objected to when we had the bill up before.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

Mr. JENKINS. The bill as amended will simply provide additional means and methods by which the architect's office can proceed to perfect bids and the preliminaries preceding the bidding on a Federal building, and it does not in any way permit the architect to determine who shall bid?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Oh, no.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Under existing law before the Government can proceed with the construction of a post-office building, it has to make a survey of the soil to see what kind of a foundation they can get, the depth of the sewer and water connections, and the slope of the street, and so forth. None of that can be done under existing law until the Government has acquired the title and the title has been approved by the Department of Justice.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

Mr. DENISON. One of the purposes of the bill is to permit that work to be done before the title has been completely perfected.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is true.

Mr. DENISON. Does the bill change the law with reference to securing this preliminary survey? It will still have to be done by bidding?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No; this changes that.

Mr. DENISON. I think that is a wise thing. They had to have this preliminary survey merely to examine the soil, to see what kind of a foundation they could have, how deep they could go for the basement, and all of that has to be done by bidding and advertising under existing law. It seems to me that is an unreasonable delay and an unnecessary precaution.

Mr. LANHAM. The expense involved in these borings for topographical surveys is relatively very little.

Mr. DENISON. Very little.

Mr. LANHAM. And the adoption of this will save about 30 days in the construction of these buildings.

Mr. DENISON. Yes; and it ought to be done.

Mr. ESLICK. As I understand the language beginning in line 5 on page 2 of the bill and closing with the word "require" in lines 10 and 11 is eliminated.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Beginning after the word "buildings" in line 7.

Mr. ESLICK. In other words, it cuts out entirely the restriction of competition in the bidding?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. Referring to the third proposition involved in the legislation, my understanding is that this will permit the architects to employ outside assistance immediately, when the site is acquired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Without waiting for the title to be approved.

Mr. KETCHAM. About how much time does the gentleman think in an ordinary project involving \$150,000 to \$200,000 that will save?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I could not tell you the amount, but it will save quite a lot. The process is very slow at times in completing the title to a lot.

Mr. KETCHAM. Ordinarily, would you say that it would save about 50 or 60 days?

Mr. ELLIOTT. It might save as much as four or five months at times.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. In several sites that I have been interested in the Government took bids, opened them on August 28, and have not done a single thing with them yet. They are holding them up, in many cases waiting to get the title to the land, and in my opinion, if this bill is passed it will not only save 90 days but in many cases more than a year, and I say that from my own experience with the department.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I think that is true. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON].

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, there has been for a long while a great deal of complaint about the delays in connection with the construction of public buildings.

We are undertaking now to speed up public building construction. It originated with the idea that we must give employment to those who are unemployed, and these large appropriations we have been making for public buildings were made for that purpose. We sometimes wait for years and years on the Treasury Department to prepare plans and estimates so that contracts may be awarded for public buildings. I am indeed glad that the Treasury Department is undertaking to change some of the rules and regulations by which this work may be speeded up. Major Heath, a representative of the Treasury Department, came before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and explained the importance of this legislation. I just want to add my hearty indorsement to the enactment of this into law. [Applause.]

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, along with others I have been objecting to this bill. My objection was directed against the language which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT] has given notice he will move to strike out.

I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the bill as amended ought to do a great deal to expedite the actual construction of buildings authorized. As far as I can ascertain, the greatest delay in the Treasury Department is in the Architect's Office. We have a very wholesome provision here however, considering the element of time necessary to accomplish the purpose which we are seeking by the additional appropriation for public buildings, in that it gives the Secretary the power to employ private architects. If he will avail himself of that provision, there is no reason in the world why a great many of these buildings should not commence immediately.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say, also, it will facilitate the preparation of plans for these various buildings; because, by reason of the fact that topographical surveys and borings may be made before title is acquired and, without the 30 days' advertising, they will know the kind of foundations and be prepared to proceed with their plans at least 30 days sooner than under the present law.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes; and it would seem to me that expediency would suggest to the department that, where they avail themselves of the provisions of this bill as to borings and surveys, they should then and there employ a local engineer for the engineering plans, and they could then use what standardized specifications may be available for that building. Of course, I am speaking of the smaller buildings. They could put a local architect in charge and start the work.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say I understand from statements made before that it is the plan of the Treasury Department, on account of the magnitude of the general building program, to do that.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes. For instance, I recall conditions in New York City when I was a city official. We had quite a large program of school buildings in New York where, with the exception of the engineering problem which is always local, according to the topography and condition of the land, we could often use the same specifications for several buildings. There is no reason why in buildings of small amounts, from \$100,000 down, they should not be able to use the same specifications. Of course, they should not be made uniform, because I think the architectural design should be such as to fit the surroundings and landscape where the building is located. There is no reason why the same specifications should not be used in many instances.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] a question. The gentleman is a member of the committee and seems to be informed. Just to-day I made inquiry at the architect's office with reference to a small \$100,000 building. They advised me that the plans would be completed at the end of this week, but it would take five weeks to write the specifications. Did anything ever come before the gentleman's committee that would enable him to answer why it would take five weeks to write the specifications for a \$100,000 building?

Mr. LANHAM. Of course I am not sufficiently familiar with the intricate work of the Supervising Architect's Office to advise the gentleman. It may be that there are many projects under contemplation. I will say, however, that inasmuch as this bill gives permission to make tests with reference to the foundations even before acquiring title, and then eliminating the 30 days that have heretofore been required for advertising, the Supervising Architect's Office will be facilitated in their work by at least a month in the preparation of these plans.

Mr. JENKINS. I wish to say I am in hearty accord with this bill. I only wish that it could go further.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I want to ask the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT] in all fairness, since he has obtained recognition to pass this bill under suspension of the rules, and I do not believe there will be any opposition to the bill as amended, if the gentleman will bring this

bill back in the last days of the session with this provision back in it?

Mr. ELLIOTT. As far as that is concerned, gentlemen, I am not responsible for anything that happens to the bill in the Senate. If anything should happen to the bill in the Senate, of course, it would have to come back here with that amendment in it. It is not any fault of mine. I am not going over to the Senate to get them to add anything to this bill, but if they do add something and it should come back here with that kind of an amendment in it, it is not my fault.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman will not aid and abet?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I want to say there are bound to be a great many complaints following any system whereby you limit or place with a department the power to say who shall be permitted to bid.

I will grant the necessity of permitting the awarding power the right to pass upon the qualifications and ability of a bidder, but where you attempt to provide ahead of time who is going to bid there is bound to be favoritism shown and resulting dissatisfaction. So I sincerely hope that when the bill comes back from the Senate it will not contain this provision. I have had some experience in connection with bills coming back from the Senate in the last hours of a session, when they are jammed through the House, but I hope nothing like that will happen in connection with this bill.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman does not believe that the body at the other end of this Capitol will do anything wrong, does he?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No.

Mr. DALLINGER. I would call the attention of the gentleman from New York to the fact that the reason why the department asked for that provision, which we are now striking out, was in order to meet this situation, which frequently occurs: The department advertises for bids for the construction of a large and expensive building, and a large number of small contractors, who are totally unable, either from lack of practical experience or from lack of capital and equipment, to erect a building of that type, apply, and under a ruling of the Comptroller General they have to be furnished with a complete set of plans. It has sometimes happened that over a hundred of these small contractors will apply for plans, and under the present law as interpreted by the Comptroller General the architect's office is obliged to furnish each one of them with a complete set of these expensive plans. It was in order to avoid this unnecessary expense that the Treasury Department asked for this particular provision.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. And, if the gentleman will permit, every time a contractor applies for a set of plans he must send a certified check for those plans, and when he gets through he returns the plans and gets his check back.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am very glad the gentleman made that statement, because there has been a great deal of misinformation as to that.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. That is the fact. If I apply for a set of plans I must send a certified check in order to secure them.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That answers the justification made in support of the provision we are now striking out. I am very glad the gentleman made that statement.

Mr. DALLINGER. It was because of the fact that some of the Members felt that this provision might be abused, our committee, through its able chairman, has incorporated an amendment to strike it out in his motion to suspend the rules and pass this bill to expedite the construction of the buildings authorized under the public-building program.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KVALE].

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to impede the progress of this measure. I sincerely hope it may pass in its amended form.

Much has been said about this building program as an aid to unemployment. Much has been said in the papers and there have been utterances on the part of the President

to the effect that the predepression wage scale would be adhered to. Yet when we call up the superintendents of construction in the various departments regarding awards of certain contracts, those of us who are interested in the construction of buildings—whether they be barracks, arsenals, post offices, hospitals, or any other kind of public construction—are told that no official notice has come to them of such administrative orders. Obviously they are not entirely at fault, because they must comply with regulations.

In order to bring this to the attention of the Members who, to my knowledge, have been interested in various construction projects throughout the United States, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, in view of the helpful nature of the material, that I be permitted to extend my remarks and to insert an article from a trade paper, the Bricklayer, Mason, and Plasterer, official publication of the international union bearing the same name, which consists of published presidential statements, a letter to the President from one of the officials of the organization, a letter from the secretary to the President, a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and a reply thereto, together with a short editorial statement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. No man in this House tries to protect organized labor any better than I do, but I have stood on this floor for the past two years and objected to newspaper articles and magazine articles going into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I was a union man myself for many years, and I have employed union men, but I will have to object to this request.

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman from Illinois withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. I will.

Mr. KVALE. I will ask the gentleman to consider the nature of the material. It is of interest to many Members of this House, and it should be of interest to all. This article consists of official correspondence between executive offices and officials of this organization, and I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. It is a magazine article, is it not?

Mr. KVALE. A very small part of it.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Much as I regret, I will have to object to the magazine article.

Mr. KVALE. May I insert the letters?

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. I have no objection to the letters.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the letters may be inserted.

There was no objection.

The letters referred to follow:

BRICKLAYERS, MASONS, AND PLASTERERS'
INTERNATIONAL UNION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., December 24, 1930.

To His Excellency, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You are quoted in the Evening Star of yesterday as saying: "The Federal Government has necessarily required contractors to maintain wage scales at their predepression levels. * * * There have been some difficulties with minor contractors, but these have been adjusted. * * * The President has informed the various executive departments that the policy of the Federal Government is that wages on contracts let by the Government shall be held up to the standard existing in the districts where the work is done."

Mr. President, you have been misinformed of the wage-reduction situation on Federal building construction and of the policy followed by the executive departments in wage matters affecting private contractors on Government construction work. We regret to inform you that we have protested to the various executive departments against the wage-reduction policy of numerous contractors now engaged in Federal building construction in various parts of the country, and in only one case have the wages been restored by the contractor.

Only yesterday we received a copy of a letter to Senator CAPPER from the Secretary of War in answer to a complaint against the Busboom Bros., now engaged in the construction of barracks at Fort Riley for the War Department, in which the Secretary of War says: "In the matter of prevailing wage scale the War Department is without authority to alter the present form of contract; it is,

therefore, a matter of regret that it is impossible to comply with the suggestions contained in your letter." Very apparently the Secretary of War is unaware of any policy of the Government in the matter of "holding wages up to the standard existing in the districts where the work is done."

We have in other cases entered protests with the War Department against wage reductions which have been made by contractors subsequent to the White House conference, at which, we understand, it was agreed that there would be no reduction in wages. Among these are the barracks now being constructed by J. A. Jones at Langley Field, Va. The J. A. Jones Construction Co., of Charlotte, N. C., in this instance has reduced the wages of the masonry mechanics from \$1.50 an hour to 75 cents an hour.

We would also call your attention to the fact that the Johnson Construction Co. has reduced the wages of its masonry mechanics on apartments being constructed at Fort Monroe from \$1.50 to \$1.25 an hour. This reduction met with the approval of the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Payne, no later than December 23.

We also call to your attention the fact that the contractors on War Department construction at Maxwell Field, Ala., and at Fort Bragg, N. C., have in every instance reduced the wages of building-trade mechanics. These cases are well known to the War Department, and these wage reductions are in effect at the present time notwithstanding our vigorous protests.

The Treasury Department has let the post-office addition at Streator, Ill., the post office at Mexia, Tex., the post office at Roanoke, Va., and is about to let the contract for the post office at Portsmouth, Va., to contractors who have and will reduce the local wage rates of building-trades mechanics. This condition is only too well known to Mr. Ferry K. Heath, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in charge of building construction.

The J. A. Jones Co., contractors for the Federal reserve bank addition at Richmond, Va., has reduced the wages of the building-trades mechanics engaged on this operation, in many cases 50 per cent. This reduction was protested by the Governor of Virginia, Mr. Pollard, by the State Labor Commissioner, Mr. Hall, and others, without result.

The Veterans' Bureau has recently awarded contracts to the Virginia Engineering Co. at Northport, Long Island, where drastic wage reductions were placed in effect by the Virginia Engineering Co. Mr. BACON, the Congressman from the Northport district, and other members of the New York congressional delegation vigorously protested against this condition to the Veterans' Bureau, and yet these reductions are still in effect and the Veterans' Bureau claims that it is powerless to act.

The same policy of wage reduction on Veterans' Bureau contracts has been put in effect by the W. P. Rose Co. on the Acute Building at Augusta, Ga., and by the Bracker Construction Co. at the hospital at Knoxville, Iowa.

The Augusta wage reduction was protested by members of the Georgia congressional delegation and the wage reduction at Knoxville, Iowa, was protested by Senator BROOKHART, but no results and no adjustments were accomplished in these cases.

We could cite a number of other instances, Mr. President, but we believe these are sufficient to convince you that you have been misled by your subordinates when they say that there have been some difficulties with minor contractors but these have been adjusted.

The War Department, the Treasury Department, and the Veterans' Bureau are all well aware of the wage reductions that have been put into effect in the cases cited. These reductions are in effect to-day.

It is hoped that if it is the policy of the administration to prevent wage reduction by private contractors on Government work, that this policy will be applied in the instances cited and that you will also extend the policy to the Government of the District of Columbia, where several wage reductions have recently been put into effect by building contractors on municipal work.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN J. GLEESON, *Secretary.*

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 27, 1930.

MY DEAR MR. GLEESON: This will acknowledge the receipt of your letter of December 24. By the President's direction it is being brought to the attention of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE RICHEY,
Secretary to the President.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, January 9, 1931.

Mr. JOHN J. GLEESON,
*Secretary Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers
International Union of America, Washington, D. C.*

SIR: Reference is made to your letter of December 24 (transmitted to this department by the President) calling attention to the expressed desire of the administration that existing wage scales shall not be lowered in connection with construction work being carried out under the present public-building program. Near the bottom of the second page of your letter you call attention to certain projects under this department where you believe that contractors are not cooperating with the Government in this respect. The other projects you mention do not come within the jurisdiction of this department.

You are advised that contracts are required by law to be awarded on the basis of competitive proposals solicited by public advertisement, and in each case to the lowest responsible bidder. It is considered that the intent of the law is to secure to the Government the advantage of the broadest possible competition, which would not be possible if contractors were restricted in regard to their labor.

However, since this department in making the estimates on which it requests authorizations from Congress for the various public-building projects bases them on the fair wage scales prevailing throughout the country, it expects that contractors shall employ on Federal work the best type of American mechanics and laborers, and it is bringing all possible pressure to bear on them to the end that the established local wage scales shall not be reduced and that local labor shall be employed to the fullest extent possible. Furthermore, it has placed before the Comptroller General of the United States the question as to whether some form of notice to bidders may not be legally inserted in construction specifications advising them of its above-mentioned policy in regard to estimates, etc. The comptroller has also been asked to decide whether a stipulation may not be included to the effect that preference shall be given to ex-service men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and to citizens of the United States and aliens who have taken out their first papers. His decision is expected shortly, and, if favorable, it should operate to remove one of the principal incentives toward the bringing in of outside labor in connection with Government contracts.

In the case of Streator, Ill., some objection was voiced against awarding the contract for extension and remodeling work to the low bidder. Nevertheless, as the contractor in question has a very high commercial rating and has satisfactorily constructed over 70 buildings under the control of this department, it was without option in the matter—the law, as above stated, requiring that a contract be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder. It did, however, call the contractor in conference and obtain from him a promise to pay the local scale of wages.

In the case of the proposed Mexia (Tex.) post office, the low bidders, before the award of the contract, were requested to advise this department as to their intention in regard to the employment of labor. They assured the department that they were perfectly willing to employ local craftsmen—if capable of doing the work—at the prevailing local wages, and also that they considered it to their own interest to use local labor and thus avoid transportation charges. On December 4 you were advised by the Acting Supervising Architect that on account of the satisfactory record of the low bidders this department could not under the law refuse to award them the contract, and that they had indicated their intention to cooperate with the department in the matter of relieving unemployment, expressing their willingness to employ local labor at the prevailing rates of wages.

In the case of the contract now in force for the construction of the new Roanoke (Va.) post office some complaints were received that the contractors were employing outside and transient laborers and taking advantage of the business depression to pay a rate of wages considerably below the standard scale for that locality. When these complaints were brought to their attention they advised it was their intention to cooperate with the department and pay the prevailing scale of wages to laborers and mechanics. They claim that they are not reducing wages, but are paying as much, and more in most instances, than local contractors. They further state that they find that local mechanics in and around Roanoke are inexperienced in the particular type of construction work that they are carrying out, and that their labor cost is exceeding that of previous similar contracts. Nevertheless, they have furnished this department with a list of their employees on this contract, the place of residence of each, and the time that each claims residence at the particular place. This list indicates that 70 per cent of the working force in connection with this contract claim residence in Roanoke, and about 77 per cent if mechanics and laborers only are considered.

In the case of the proposed remodeling of the Portsmouth (Va.) post office, the low bidders, prior to the award of the contract, were requested to advise whether it was their intention to employ local labor to the extent available, and at the established rates of wages for the locality, if they obtained the contract. Upon their assurance that they would carry out the wishes of the department so far as practicable, the contract was, on December 27, awarded to them.

From the information given above it will be seen that this department is doing everything in its power under the present legislation to obtain the employment of local labor and the maintenance of existing wage scales.

Respectfully,

FERRY K. HEATH,
Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

JANUARY 10, 1931.

Mr. FERRY K. HEATH,
*Assistant Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.*

SIR: Your letter of January 9 referring to our letter of December 24, 1930, to the President, received. The President in his statement to the press made no reference to securing the "broadest possible competition," but said that "wages on contracts let by the Government shall be held up to the scale existing in the districts where the work is done."

We note the assurances from contractors received in the four cases to which reply was made. The contractor at Roanoke has

already notified our representative that our members must take a 25 per cent an hour reduction if they desire employment on the Roanoke post office. We anticipate like action on the part of the other contractors in the three other cases mentioned. We have no other means of judging the future policy of these contractors but by their past and present policy, which is one of wage reduction.

However, we are at a loss to understand why no reply was made to the Federal reserve bank contract at Richmond, Va. This contract was approved by the Federal Reserve Board at the Treasury Department. The members of this board are all presidential appointees, and we fail to see why these appointees of the President are not requiring the contractor on the Richmond Federal Reserve Bank "to maintain wage scales at the predepression levels." Only one of the masonry mechanics on this operation is a resident of Richmond. All of the others have been imported into the city of Richmond and the wage rates have been reduced on the average of 33 1/2 per cent.

Mr. Secretary, since we wrote our letter to the President the Oklahoma City post office was let by you to a contractor who notified your department that he would run this job on an "open-shop" policy. The masonry mechanics of Oklahoma City are all members of organized labor; "the open-shop policy" means these men will not be employed and that a wage reduction will be put into effect.

Reference is made to the fact that the Comptroller General of the United States now has before him the question as to whether or not some form of notice to bidders may not legally be inserted in construction specifications. We have been well aware of the submission of this question to the comptroller for several months past and we have been told from time to time that the comptroller would issue a decision "within the next two or three days."

We have no hope that any action will be taken at any time in the near future by the office of the Comptroller General; furthermore, we feel that the President's statement was well considered prior to its issuance and he makes no reference in his statement to awaiting any decision of the Comptroller General.

It was our impression from the White House reply that you, as the principal construction officer of the Federal Government, would also make reply for the construction division of the War Department and also for the Veterans' Bureau. However, if we did not get the correct impression we would be more than pleased if you would arrange it so that the cases cited, which concern the War Department and the Veterans' Bureau will be forwarded to the proper official for his attention.

The following is an additional list of Government operations concerning which you may observe our comment with regards to the firms to whom contracts in connection therewith have been awarded, and concerning whom it is our firm belief that they will not be in any way disposed to conform to the existing standards or scale of wages in the districts where the work is to be done:

Fort Sam Houston, Tex.: Barracks, Fort Sam Houston. Contract awarded to Banspach Bros., who employ Mexicans, exclusively, and pay one-third of the prevailing wage rate.

Oklahoma City, Okla.: Post office. Contract awarded to Devault & Dietrich. Devault notified the Treasury Department prior to the award that he was going to work open shop, which in effect means that he is going to reduce wages. The contract was awarded over the protests of the Oklahoma State Federation of Labor.

Memphis, Tenn.: Nurses' home and addition. Awarded to Algernon-Blair, unfair contractor to organized labor, of Montgomery, Ala. Algernon-Blair is well known to all departments of the Government as a wage-cutting firm.

Scott Field, Ill.: Airport. Contract awarded to Noble Construction Co. This firm is also known as a wage-cutting firm. The contract was awarded over protests of all building-trades organizations in St. Louis and vicinity.

Vicksburg, Miss.: Larkin Experimental Dam. Wages reduced by the Government itself from \$1.50 to \$1.25 per hour. Protests to the Assistant Secretary of War and Chief of Engineers were unheeded.

Chillico, Okla.: Government Indian school, Chillico, Okla., located 4 miles south of Arkansas City, Kans. Wages reduced by the Interior Department.

Alexandria, Va.: Post office. Contract awarded to Beaman-Coleman, unfair contractors to organized labor.

Naval Base, Norfolk, Va.: Barracks. Contract about to be awarded to Worsham Bros., of Knoxville, Tenn. Worsham Bros. are wage-reducing contractors.

Spartanburg, S. C.: Post office. Contract awarded to unfair contractor to organized labor, Algernon-Blair, of Montgomery, Ala.

Kosciusko, Miss.: Post office. Contract awarded to unfair contractor to organized labor, Algernon-Blair, of Montgomery, Ala.

Boston, Mass.: Post-office foundation. Contract awarded to unfair contractors to organized labor, Merritt, Chapman & Scott. Wage reductions put into effect over protests of Boston labor unions.

Washington, D. C.: Gallinger Hospital addition. Contract awarded to W. P. Rose Co., unfair contractors to organized labor, and a wage-reducing firm.

Coatesville, Pa.: Veterans' hospital. Contract awarded to Samford Bros., at Montgomery, Ala.; wages are reduced and cheap labor imported from the South, notwithstanding the protests of the Pennsylvania labor organizations.

Metuchen, N. J.: Raritan Arsenal. Officers' quarters. Contract awarded to the Alliance Construction Co., notwithstanding the fact that we notified the construction division of the War Department that the Alliance Construction Co. had no previous experi-

ence in new construction and that they were engaged in sand blasting and cleaning old buildings, and they also said they would not pay the prevailing scale of wages. The construction division of the War Department, in answer to the complaints, said the War Department did not consider that any experience would be necessary. We believe this shows an apparent lack of administrative ability in so far as it concerns construction matters in the War Department.

Panama Canal Zone: Contract for barracks at Panama recently was awarded by the War Department to the J. A. Jones Co., of Charlotte, N. C., wage-cutting contractors noted above. This is the first contract to be awarded to a wage-cutting firm in the Canal Zone and it will result in a disruption of labor conditions in the Zone. The awarding of this contract to Jones will affect not only the building trades but it will also affect metal trades and labor in general.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN J. GLEESON, *Secretary.*

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

IT IS WITHIN THE POWER OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD TO RELIEVE THE FINANCIAL AND COMMERCIAL DISTRESS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen, I recognize the conditions which exist and the need for employment. I am ready and willing to cooperate in every way possible to provide employment for the unfortunate out of work. In this bill we are doing it, but at a great sacrifice, as we are eliminating the safeguards which we have always tried to put around the appropriations we make.

We have been appropriating large sums of money and no doubt will be obliged, due to conditions which exist, to appropriate many and many more millions. But I doubt very much, even if we should appropriate \$500,000,000 more for construction, whether that would to any great extent relieve the unfortunate situation existing in our Nation. The Government itself can not create enough employment to provide work for the 6,000,000 out of work. A plan and policy should be established whereby the business of the country, which has suffered so much, might be aided and assisted in reestablishing itself. So far nothing has been done by this Congress or by this administration, with the exception of appropriating large sums of money. I feel it is high time that the administration—and if the administration continues to refuse, Congress should—adopt a constructive plan that would aid in the reestablishment of confidence and the resumption of business.

I feel that the hastening of this construction will not prevent the daily closing of banks in every section of our country. Some weeks ago I called attention to a proposal which I believed would be helpful and would be beneficial and which would relieve the financial situation of the country.

I advised that the Federal Reserve Board extend its rule as to rediscount paper such as finance corporation paper and municipal bond—whereby securities that are absolutely sound may be rediscounted and the banks, business, and manufacturers of the country aided and relieved.

I believe if this were done we could start reconstruction not only by the Government of the United States but by thousands and thousands of plants and factories and businesses that have been obliged to close down. For this reason I communicated with the Federal Reserve Board and asked for this relief for the Nation; but, unfortunately, the director has answered me by stating that the Federal Reserve Board is without such power. I have examined the law and I am satisfied that the Federal Reserve Board has the power to extend its rediscount activities, and should act, in these distressing and alarming days; and have so answered his communication.

I am sincere in this matter and I believe that by the extension of rediscount a great deal could be done to relieve the present existing conditions.

I insist that it is within the power of the Federal Reserve Board to relieve the financial and commercial distress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may embody in my remarks the letter I wrote to the Federal Reserve Board, the reply of the Federal Reserve Board, and my answer thereto.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

DECEMBER 12, 1930.

HON. EUGENE MEYER,
Governor Federal Reserve Board,
Treasury Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MEYER: Without going into the other causes responsible for the present alarming situation, I feel that the terrific stock inflation, and the unloading during the past two years, of millions and millions of shares of such inflated, and in many instances, worthless stocks, upon the masses by means of high-power methods, has contributed more than any other cause, and is responsible to a greater degree for the increasingly desperate condition of our country to-day. Such inflation has drained the working capital required for legitimate business, and has resulted in a tremendous stagnation of the commerce of the Nation, which in turn has led to nation-wide unemployment, thereby creating not only want and misery, but alarming discontent.

I believe that it is within the power of the Federal Reserve Board to accept for rediscount purposes—in addition to notes, drafts, bills of exchange, and Government bonds—the paper of finance corporations secured by automobiles, radios, refrigerators, and other like commodities. But in addition thereto, because of existing conditions, I feel that the Federal Reserve Board should be authorized to accept for rediscount, municipal, public utility, and railroad bonds, as well as real estate securities—but only under safe and sane regulations—and propose to offer a bill that will grant such additional power.

I feel that you will agree with me when I say that, with the exception of the few extremely large banking institutions, the major portion of our banks are to-day greatly handicapped, and for no other reason than the fact that they have on hand a very large amount of good but unliquid assets. Already this has caused the closing of a dangerously large number of banks, and threatens to close an even still greater number.

Since the Federal reserve system was created for the purpose of aiding our business, industry, and agriculture, its powers should be expanded so that it may successfully cope with the situation confronting us to-day.

Although I know you to be familiar with the basic causes of the conditions existent to-day, nevertheless, I now take the liberty of submitting to you certain important facts in this matter, derived from careful investigation and survey.

It is a fact, that billions upon billions of dollars of worthless stock, in 1928 and 1929, were unloaded upon people in every walk of life, who, as I said on the floor of the House in 1929 and again just the other day, were inveigled by the alluring pictures painted by some of our most prominent financiers and industrial leaders. Then came the inevitable crash, and in order to comply with the demands of the banks for additional securities or for a reduction and payment of their loans, these small investors were obliged to heavily withdraw from their business the very capital necessary for the successful conduct of said business. In addition, many were unable to meet the demands of the banks, and a large number of these, in order to aid the small business man, have been and still are carrying on these very loans, secured by collateral which, though good, can not be disposed of without great loss.

Therefore it is my firm belief that if at least some of such collateral held by these banks could be utilized for rediscount they would be tremendously relieved. This in turn would enable them to extend to our businesses and industries much-needed aid, and business would thus be permitted to resume its uncurtailed activities, which would bring about a resumption of employment.

I well recognize that a few powerful financiers will object to my plan on the ground that it will result in inflation. Yet it must be conceded that expansion will not now be detrimental but, on the contrary, will be very helpful. For example, you know that brokers' loans have been reduced from above \$6,000,000,000 to \$2,000,000,000, and these loans were on collateral securities not as safe as contemplated in my plan.

That money is plentiful can not be denied. Thus, for example, money can to-day be obtained in New York for gambling purposes at rates as low as 1½ and 2 per cent. Why not make at least some of it available to the smaller borrowers in need of money for legitimate purposes? I am aware that the few powerful financial institutions have in their vaults approximately \$7,000,000,000 worth of securities available for rediscount purposes. Our aim, however, should be to give aid to the banks which, through no fault of theirs, are not so happily situated.

Such extension can do no possible harm but may, and in all likelihood will, revive business activities, which will result in employment for at least some of the 7,000,000 of men and women now unemployed.

Knowing your splendid record and your ability as a financier and man of vast experience, I have here humbly set forth my plan and do hope to hear from you to obtain your views.

Very sincerely yours,

A. J. SABATH.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD,
Washington, December 29, 1930.

HON. A. J. SABATH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SABATH: This is the first opportunity I have had to acknowledge your letter of December 12 in which you suggest that paper secured by municipal and railroad bonds, etc., be made eligible for rediscount at the Federal reserve banks. I notice that you interpret the existing law as giving the Federal reserve banks power to discount paper of finance corporations secured by various commodities. This is not in accordance with the law and the regulations of the Federal Reserve Board, which do not permit the rediscount of finance paper, with certain minor exceptions specifically provided for in the act, such as the paper of cotton factors. I believe that it may be of service to you to see an article on paper eligible for rediscount at the Federal reserve banks in the bulletin for July, 1930, of which I inclose a copy.

You will notice from this article that of the 8,522 member banks there were 99 that had no eligible paper; 1,749 that had between 0.1 and 10 per cent of their paper eligible for rediscount; 4,813, including 4,427 country banks that had between 10 and 40 per cent; and 1,861, including 1,806 country banks, that had 40 per cent or over. This indicates that there are very few banks that do not have enough eligible paper to use at the reserve banks when the need arises. I am not inclined to believe, therefore, that enlarging the class of paper eligible for rediscount at the reserve banks would help the credit or the business situation.

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE MEYER, Governor.

JANUARY 19, 1931.

HON. EUGENE MEYER,
Governor Federal Reserve Board,
Treasury Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: In your reply of December 12, 1930, you say that "with certain minor exceptions specifically provided for in the act, the rediscount of finance paper is not in accordance with the law and the regulations of the Federal Reserve Board," and call my attention to an article in the Federal Reserve Bulletin of July, 1929, containing data on paper eligible for rediscount, which you state may be of service to me.

As per your suggestion, I have read the article and have studied the act and am still of the opinion that it is within the power of the Federal Reserve Board to permit the rediscount of finance corporation paper. Especially do I call to your attention that part of the article, on page 401, referring to the "tests of eligibility," which reads as follows and which, I maintain, sustains my views:

"* * * the Federal reserve act provides in a general way that so-called commercial paper be eligible for discount with the reserve banks. This is a class of paper that a typical member bank would acquire in considerable volume in the course of its ordinary operations, and at the same time one that is so liquid that it can be safely held by the banks of issue. Paper created in the process of financing the flow of commodities in production and trade arises out of loans that are ordinarily liquidated by the borrower with funds received in the natural course of events from the sale of goods underlying the transaction."

The article also properly states that—

"* * * the Federal reserve system was established for the purpose, among others, of creating an agency from which member banks can obtain credit for seasonal or emergency needs."

Does the board maintain that there is no emergency existing at this time? To my mind if ever there was an emergency it is now, and this, I feel, no one can successfully deny. For while 439 banks closed their doors in 1929, during the year 1930, 934 banks were forced to suspend business.

You further state, "* * * that of the 8,522 member banks there were 99 that had no eligible paper; 1,749 that had between 0.1 and 10 per cent of their paper eligible for rediscount; 4,813 that had between 10 and 40 per cent; and 1,861 that had 40 per cent or over."

And again, I feel justified in asking for, or suggesting, the broadening of the board's regulations so as to make eligible for rediscount, at least for the present, the finance corporation paper, since the compilation does disclose that there are 99 banks without any and 1,749 with but from 0.1 to 10 per cent of their paper eligible for rediscount. And since these figures are as of December 31, 1929, I can not help but believe, that in view of the prevalent conditions and the continuous drain upon the banks, that the amount of rediscountable, eligible paper held by the 8,000 of the approximately 8,320 remaining member banks has been greatly reduced. The seriousness of conditions is evidenced by the unfortunate, ever-increasing number of banks forced to close up due to the fact that they are unable, unless it be at a great sacrifice, to dispose of their slow and frozen paper assets.

I concede that there are any number of large banks in possession of a surplus of rediscountable paper, and consequently not in need of any aid. But these are not the institutions about whose aid or relief I am concerned. I am interested, yes, vitally so, in relieving not only the several thousand banks whose rediscountable paper has been depleted and the thousands upon thousands of their depositors, but also in arresting the ever-increasing number of failures.

If, however, you still look with disfavor at my plan, may I not ask what you can suggest which may relieve the distressed banks, restore confidence, and bring about the resumption of business and employment.

Very respectfully yours,

A. J. SABATH.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT] to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

ARMY BAND AT CONFEDERATE VETERANS' REUNION AT MONTGOMERY, ALA.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the bill (H. R. 14573) authorizing the attendance of the Army Band at the Confederate Veterans' Reunion to be held at Montgomery, Ala., being No. 841 on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if he has made up his mind to accept the amendment I proposed when we had the matter up before?

Mr. HILL of Alabama. That amendment will be agreeable to me.

Mr. JENKINS. With that understanding, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to permit the United States Army Band to attend and give concerts at the Forty-first Annual Confederate Veterans' Reunion to be held at Montgomery, Ala., June 1 to 5, inclusive, 1931.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of defraying the expenses of the band in attending such reunion there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$7,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That in addition to transportation and Pullman accommodations the leaders and members of the Army Band be allowed not to exceed \$5 per day each for actual living expenses while on this detail, and that the payment of such expenses shall be in addition to the pay and allowances to which members of the United States Army Band would be entitled while serving at their permanent station.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to strike out the colon after the word "necessary" in line 11, and insert in lieu thereof a period, and strike out the remaining language of the section.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENKINS: Beginning on page 1, line 11, after the word "necessary," strike out the colon and the remainder of the language in the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, a number of us do not have the bill before us, and I ask unanimous consent that the language stricken out be read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the language proposed to be stricken.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That in addition to transportation and Pullman accommodations the leaders and members of the Army Band be allowed not to exceed \$5 per day each for actual living expenses while on this detail, and that the payment of such expenses shall be in addition to the pay and allowances to which members of the United States Army Band would be entitled while serving at their permanent station.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Ohio if the bill, as amended, will cover the meals of these men. As I understand it, these men are mostly married men and they have their established homes here. I am sure the gentleman does not want to put the additional expense upon them of providing their own meals while away from home.

Mr. JENKINS. No; my object is this: I think the language in the first line of section 2 is sufficient to pay all expenses, because it says that the Secretary of War shall transport these men down there and shall provide for all their expenses. The part I am striking out is the provision that means that the Secretary of War will transport the band down there, pay all the railroad expenses and all other expenses, and, in addition to that, pay them \$5 a day in addition to their base pay at home. I do not believe they ought to be paid anything in addition to their base pay at home, but that they should be paid their legitimate expenses, which the Secretary of War will pay out of the \$7,500.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. And that includes meals?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; it includes all expenses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT OR NEAR M'GREGOR, IOWA

The SPEAKER. The Chair said in reply to an inquiry by several Members that the Chair thought we would not return to the calendar. The attention of the Chair has been called to the fact that there is one bridge bill on the calendar in which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] is interested. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10621) authorizing W. L. Eichendorf, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the town of McGregor, Iowa.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in reading the report on the bill I notice a letter from the person who desires this franchise, written almost a year ago, in which he states that there is no other bridge in the vicinity of this place. I wish to direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that on the last Consent Calendar day we passed a bridge bill for the identical place where it was represented the work was in progress.

Mr. HAUGEN. It is in progress in a small way.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it the intention to have two toll bridges at that place?

Mr. HAUGEN. Not at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. My colleague [Mr. NELSON] then stated that the piers were in course of construction in justification of the postponement of the effective date when the work was to be completed. I wish to inquire whether it is the plan of the committee to recommend a competition bridge at this same place?

Mr. HAUGEN. No; they are quite a distance apart.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Illinois says they are not in the same place. I will ask him if McGregor is not opposite Prairie du Chien and Prairie du Chien is not opposite McGregor?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is a little south of Prairie du Chien, and the nearest bridge is now about 65 miles distant.

Mr. STAFFORD. We authorized last year a bridge at this same place.

Mr. HAUGEN. Perhaps the people of Marquette will go on and complete the bridge.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. If we authorize two bridges, and they are both built, the public will have an opportunity to obtain a reasonable toll by reason of the competition.

Mr. HAUGEN. That would be true if they built two bridges.

Mr. STAFFORD. If one party is forced to purchase the franchise for the other bridge so as to do away with competitive conditions it could increase the amount invested and thus mulct the public.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to object to this bill. I have investigated this and find that it is much needed. I understand that the bridge is very necessary at this point. I do not intend to object for that reason.

Mr. HAUGEN. The highway commission has recommended the bridge.

Mr. PATTERSON. I understand that is true and that a constitutional provision of one State prevents that State from helping to build the bridge. I think that every bridge bill ought to have a provision regulating the amount they ask for tolls. After this I shall see if we can not get a provision of that kind.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Some provision ought to be made for adequate appropriations for the administration of toll bridge legislation so that the War Department can carefully check the actual investment, so that when the municipality or State takes over the bridge in the future they will not have to pay on a fictitious valuation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, W. L. Eichendorf, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the town of McGregor, Iowa, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon W. L. Eichendorf, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is located, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The said W. L. Eichendorf, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, are hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. After the completion of such bridge, as determined by the Secretary of War, either the State of Wisconsin, the State of Iowa, any public agency or political subdivision of either of such States, within or adjoining which any part of the bridge is located, or any two or more of them jointly, may, at any time, acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in such bridge and its approaches and any interest in real property necessary therefor, by purchase or by condemnation or expropriation, in accordance with the laws of either of such States governing the acquisition of private property for public purposes by condemnation or expropriation. If at any time after the expiration of 20 years after the completion of such bridge the same is acquired by condemnation or expropriation, the amount of damages or compensation to be allowed shall not include good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing such bridge and its approaches, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in value; (2) the actual cost of acquiring such interest in real property; (3) actual financing and promotion costs, not to exceed 10 per cent of the sum of the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches and acquiring such interest in real property; and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements.

SEC. 5. If such bridge shall be taken over or acquired by the States or public agencies, or political subdivisions thereof, or by either of them, as provided in section 4 of this act, and if tolls are thereafter charged for the use thereof the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor including a reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 20 years from the date of acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 6. W. L. Eichendorf, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, shall, within 90 days after the completion of such bridge, file with the Secretary of War, and with the highway departments of the States of Wisconsin and Iowa, a sworn itemized statement, showing the actual original cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches, the actual cost of acquiring any interest

in real property necessary therefor, and the actual financing and promotion costs. The Secretary of War may, and upon the request of the highway departments of either of such States, shall, at any time within three years after the completion of such bridge, investigate such costs and determine the accuracy and the reasonableness of the costs alleged in the statement of costs so filed, and shall make a finding of the actual and reasonable costs of constructing, financing, and promoting such bridge; for the purpose of such investigation, the said W. L. Eichendorf, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, shall make available all records in connection with the construction, financing, and promotion thereof. The findings of the Secretary of War as to the reasonable cost of the construction, financing, and promotion of the bridge, shall be conclusive for the purposes mentioned in section 4 of this act, subject only to review in a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake.

SEC. 7. The rights to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all of the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act, is hereby granted to W. L. Eichendorf, his heirs, legal representatives and assigns; and any corporation to which or any person to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure, or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation or person.

SEC. 8. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 18, after the word "such," strike out the word "interest" and insert the word "interests" in lieu thereof. Line 24, after the word "shall," insert the words "at any time."

Page 4, line 8, after the word "including," strike out the word "a."

Page 5, line 7, after the word "highway," strike out the word "departments" and insert the word "department" in lieu thereof. Line 17, after the word "reasonable," strike out the word "cost" and insert the word "costs" in lieu thereof. Line 22, after the word "the," strike out the word "rights" and insert the word "right" in lieu thereof.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS SANTA ROSA SOUND, FLA.

Mr. YON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up and consider at this time the bill (H. R. 14679) authorizing Pensacola Bridge Corporation (a Florida corporation), its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Santa Rosa Sound, in the State of Florida, at or near Grassy Point in Santa Rosa County, Fla., and repealing the act approved May 26, 1928, as amended February 19, 1930, authorizing construction of a bridge across Santa Rosa Sound, which I send to the desk and ask to have read. This is an emergency matter. The company asking for the franchise to be transferred from the two counties does so because the counties have not the funds to do this, and the State road department has not, either. The bridge is not on the line of any State highway or Federal-aid highway.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes, Pensacola Bridge Corporation (a Florida corporation), its successors and assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Santa Rosa Sound, in the State of Florida, in accordance with the plans and location of the boards of county commissioners of Escambia and Santa Rosa, Fla., approved by the Secretary of War December 5, 1928, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Grassy Point in Santa Rosa County, Fla., and in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. After the completion of such bridge, as determined by the Secretary of War, either the State of Florida, any political subdivision thereof within or adjoining which any part of such bridge is located, or any two or more of them jointly, may at any time acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in such bridge and its approaches, and any interest in real property necessary therefor, by purchase or by condemnation or expropriation, in accordance with the laws of such State governing the acquisition of private property for public purposes by condemnation or expropriation. If at any time after the expiration of five years after the completion of such bridge the same is acquired

by condemnation or expropriation, the amount of damages or compensation to be allowed shall not include good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing such bridge and its approaches, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in value; (2) the actual cost of acquiring such interests in real property; (3) actual financing and promotion cost, not to exceed 10 per cent of the sum of the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches and acquiring such interests in real property; and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements.

Sec. 3. If such bridge shall at any time be taken over or acquired by the State of Florida, or by any municipality or other political subdivision or public agency thereof, under the provisions of section 2 of this act, and if tolls are thereafter charged for the use thereof, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 20 years from the date of acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

Sec. 4. Pensacola Bridge Corporation (a Florida corporation), its successors and assigns, shall, within 90 days after the completion of such bridge, file with the Secretary of War and with the Highway Department of the State of Florida, a sworn itemized statement showing the actual original cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches, the actual cost of acquiring any interest in real property necessary therefor, and the actual financing and promotion costs. The Secretary of War may, and at the request of the Highway Department of the State of Florida shall, at any time within three years after the completion of such bridge, investigate such costs and determine the accuracy and the reasonableness of the costs alleged in the statement of the costs so filed, and shall make a finding of the actual and reasonable costs of constructing, financing, and promoting such bridge; for the purpose of such investigation the said Pensacola Bridge Corporation (a Florida corporation), its successors and assigns, shall make available all of its records in connection with the construction, financing, and promotion thereof. The findings of the Secretary of War as to the reasonable costs of the construction, financing, and promotion of the bridge shall be conclusive for the purposes mentioned in section 2 of this act, subject only to review in a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake.

Sec. 5. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to Pensacola Bridge Corporation (a Florida corporation), its successors and assigns; and any corporation to which, or any person to whom, such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation or person.

Sec. 6. The act granting the consent of Congress to the Boards of County Commissioners of the counties of Escambia and Santa Rosa, in the State of Florida, to construct, maintain, and operate a free bridge across Santa Rosa Sound, in the State of Florida, approved May 26, 1928, as amended by the act extending the time for constructing said bridge, approved February 19, 1930, is hereby repealed.

Sec. 7. The approval by Secretary of War under date of December 5, 1928, of location and plans of bridge across Santa Rosa Sound in the State of Florida and all the rights thereunder are hereby transferred from the Boards of County Commissioners of the counties of Escambia and Santa Rosa, Fla., to the Pensacola Bridge Corporation, its successors and assigns.

Sec. 8. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "Florida," insert "in accordance with the plans and location of the Boards of County Commissioners of Escambia and Santa Rosa, Fla., approved by the Secretary of War December, 1928."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "Florida," insert the word "and."

Page 5, strike out sections 6 and 7.

Page 6, line 8, change the number of the section from 8 to 6.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The committee amendments were agreed to; and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing Pensacola Bridge Corporation (a Florida corporation), its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Santa Rosa Sound, in the State of Florida, at or near Grassy Point, in Santa Rosa County, Fla."

TERMS OF FIRST-CLASS POSTMASTERS

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the terms of first-class postmasters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, while we are at the desirable business of eliminating lame-duck sessions of Congress, I think we ought also to eliminate lame-duck postmasters.

To prevent the continued abuse of having postmasterships filled by occupants not sanctioned by the United States Senate as required by the Constitution, I have introduced and shall press for passage a bill that will declare any first-class post office vacant one year after a postmaster's term has expired, when the postmaster continues in office without appointment or confirmation of the Senate.

To so continue a postmaster is certainly in contravention of the spirit of the law, if not actually a violation of the law itself. The Constitution and the statutes contemplate that every four years the United States Senate shall pass on the appointment of every postmaster.

To hold a postmaster in office indefinitely after his term has expired, without even submitting his name to the Senate for its "advice and consent," as provided by law, is a denial of the Senate's prerogatives, and is an unwarranted usurpation of power by the executive branch of the Government.

There is no justification for such action. If the Postmaster General does not intend to recommend to the President a postmaster's reappointment, an examination for a new appointment should immediately be called and the vacancy filled as expeditiously as possible. If it is intended to reappoint a postmaster his name should promptly be sent to the Senate, so that body may pass on the appointment. It is nothing short of conspiracy to hold a postmaster in office after his term has expired, and at the same time withhold the submission of his name from the Senate, especially when the question has been raised as to the postmaster's fitness for the office or as to his conduct in the office.

In justice to hold-over postmasters, in due regard to prerogatives of the United States Senate, and in fairness to the public, if the Executive wishes to retain such a postmaster, the appointment should be submitted to the Senate, where the facts may be passed upon. Failure to do this certainly gives grounds for suspicion. Any postmaster whose official conduct has been questioned would of course insist on vindication before the Senate if he had nothing to fear in an impartial review.

A Postmaster General who insists on retaining a postmaster, in spite of the fact that such reappointment not only has not been recommended but has on the contrary been opposed because the question of fitness for reappointment has been raised, should certainly seek approval of this unusual course, by the United States Senate, where the Constitution places both the right and duty to pass on such a matter.

A Postmaster General who conspires to thwart the purpose of the law by refusing an official review of the facts in this manner is derelict in his duty.

Since, however, this situation does exist, and could lead to the further situation where the Executive could circumvent the Constitution, were he so minded, by holding over indefinitely any or all postmasters without appointment or reference to the Senate, it appears necessary to make mandatory the vacating of postmasterships a reasonable length of time after his term has expired. It is a fair, just measure. There is no reason for keeping a postmaster in office even a year after his term has expired if there is any reason why his name should not be submitted to the Senate.

The fear that the Senate would not confirm a given appointment is all the more reason for declaring the office

vacant. Certainly a year is ample time to investigate any charges as to a postmaster's right to reappointment; after that the Senate should be given the opportunity to decide; otherwise there is certainly the right to assume that the Executive has something to conceal from the Senate or he has no confidence in their exercising their constitutional prerogative fairly. The first assumption would be a reflection on the Executive and the second a reflection on the Senate. Anyway, it is high time that this pernicious practice be stopped.

THE SOLDIERS' IDEA OF THE ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by publishing a poem written by a disabled American war veteran relative to the adjusted-compensation certificate. This request was made at a meeting of Disabled American Veterans last Saturday evening at the Raleigh Hotel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following poem written by a veteran of the World War. It was sent to me by A. W. Blackstone, Jonesboro, Ill.

After five long years of pleading
Congress passed the bonus bill;
You or I will hardly get it
But our beneficiaries will.
They never drafted my small brother,
It was I they gave the gun,
And my orders held no clauses
When we went to stop the Hun.

I don't have no blood relation
And there's bound to be a row;
I often ask myself this question—
"Who will get it anyhow?"
I'll not die and leave a widow,
As for children I have none;
Anyway I am the fellow
That you gave the pack and gun.

Twenty years will find me feeble,
If I live to see the day,
For already I am crippled
And my head is turning gray;
And there's thousands of my buddies
Down and out, and all alone
Who will have to find existence
In some military home.

Oh! the future makes me shudder,
Fills my heart with darkest fear,
For my buddies will be victims
Of some scheming profiteer;
For the men who need it mostly
Have naught of the country's wealth,
And they'll have to pawn this paper
Trying to restore their health.

After sober meditation
All the solace I can get,
We can use it to advantage
When we pay life's final debt;
And I'm going to leave instructions
When I come to make my will,
Write these words upon my tombstone—
Paid for with the "bonus bill."

IN MEMORY OF THE BATTLE OF NEW ORLEANS

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by extending a speech which I delivered in New Orleans on January 8 last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under my leave to extend and revise my remarks by printing a speech I delivered on the plains of Chalmette, where was fought the Battle of New Orleans on January 8, 1815, permit me to observe that that great historic event was observed with an éclat and splendor worthy of the brilliant chapter in the chronicles of nations that Chalmette has written for all time. Ceremonies of an appropriate character were held at the base of Jackson Statue, in Jackson Square, New Orleans, at which many great Americans assembled and

addressed their countrymen on the enduring significance of the glorious day in American history.

On the night of that great day in the life of not only New Orleans but of the Nation a banquet was given in honor of Commodore Ernest Lee Jahncke, First Assistant Secretary of the Navy, during the course of which he delivered a memorable address relating and reciting from the records the splendid part played by the then American Navy in bringing victory to our arms, for victory, victory, victoire, victoire rang out from every household on the night 116 years ago, when men, women, and children reveled with the wildest joy in the knowledge that the invader had been repelled and that the city was free.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, "And the captain of the Lord's host said unto Joshua, 'Loose thy shoe from off thy foot for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.'"

The reserve officers domiciled or resident of the city of New Orleans are gathered here at the foot of Jackson's monument on the plains of Chalmette to reverently observe and commemorate the day on which the Battle of New Orleans was fought and won by American forces 116 years ago, or as history makes it in the light of time, January 8, 1815.

The power of the magic carpet is in this sward on which, with bowed and bared heads, we are observing with appropriate exercises that memorable occasion in American history, for we are transported backward in the flight of time to other years when began the wonderful drama, the last act of which was played out on the spot on which we stand.

My countrymen, it is not flattering to ourselves nor agreeable at times to recall the vicissitudes, calamities, and catastrophes of the War of 1812, but I think we should do so, lest we forget the terrible lessons they convey. We should recount that which is ancient in our history for the purpose of gathering a light by which to guide our footsteps in the future, even at the risk of irritating those sensitive souls that recoil at the thought of looking backward to our nights of despair.

Of course, you know that the War of 1812 was disastrous to American arms, and the treaty of Ghent was consummated by England only on the theory that disintegration had already set in and that the States calling themselves the United States would soon be seeking the protection of the mother country and would be colonies once more—not later than five years after the signing of the treaty, which would carry it to about 1820.

Canadian, English, and continental newspapers were convinced that the collapse of the young Republic of the West was impending; that it was staggering to its destruction; that its fall was at hand. Monarchists the world over were confident that the United States had run its brief course and that its hour was about to strike.

If England had thought otherwise she would have insisted upon the harsh terms which she had laid down at the beginning of the discussion of the treaty we sought, so desperate was our situation. She thought we were incapable or did not care to fight. Had not her soldiers burned our Capitol; had they not been almost uniformly successful on land and sea in their encounters with our soldiers and sailors? Did not the apathy of a large section of the country show it was an extremely unpopular war? That is one great reason why our victory on the plains of Chalmette was transcendent in its importance—because it obliterated the catastrophes of that war which had made school children cry out in the streets of their villages and hamlets and towns at the degradation into which their country had fallen. That condition was deplorable, so deplorable that Lord Castlereagh and others who were in power and in control of the British Government at the time said that "every port and city in America is in our hands, and the Americans are little better than prisoners in their own land," and gloatingly and boastfully declared that they were in a position to dictate any terms that they might feel inclined to dictate.

In order to thoroughly understand the gravity of the situation, not only as our national honor was concerned, but the menacing attitude of England and Spain with respect to the vast empire of territory known as the Louisiana Purchase, let us swing backward; let us turn back the hand of time; let us roll up the curtain on the mighty drama played out on a solemn, brooding, but at times terrible sea stage, the Gulf of Mexico and her titanic daughter, the Mississippi River; let us peer into the days of romance and adventure, the day of the conquistadors, the buccaneers, the pirates, the days that ran through a century and gave to Spain, France, and England their greatest discoverers and sea captains. The history and tradition of that time are so interwoven and blended that it is utterly impossible to separate them if we would—and would we, if we could? For is not history what the great Napoleon said it is—"a fable agreed upon"? And were there not nobler souls than those whose exploits are recorded, if a sacred bard had but sung them into immortality? Charlotte Cushman wrote: "God conceived the earth—that was poetry; He formed it—that was sculpture; He colored it—that was painting; He peopled it—that was the divine drama." One thing is certain, every generation has had an opportunity to play out on an appropriate stage the part allotted to it in the grand drama of mankind, but in no generation has tradition given to the field of adventure so much poetry, sculpture, painting, song, and romance as to the age of Columbus, Cabot, Hudson, Pineda, Cortez, Pizarro, De Soto,

La Salle, without reference to their chronological order, and a score of others, such as Drake, Magellan, Morgan, who were not only possessed of the passion of the sea wild life, but for booty and spoils also.

But let it not be supposed that these sea marauders were not the heroes of their native lands. They gave a romance to their countries which the regular armies and navies could never win.

But on the carpet or on the wings of the morning let us fly backward and move with those martial spirits that are now no more. For, guided by history's pages, we see Navarez going from Mexico to Florida and touching at the mouth of the Mississippi River. He was a Spanish conquistador, a nobleman, and explorer. That was in 1528. Fourteen years later we see Hernando de Soto viewing the Mississippi River at some place near where the Arkansas joins her. Though a splendid Spanish conquistador, a striking figure in that romantic period, he was buried darkly at night, as was said of Sir John Moore, and left alone with his glory. But he had a magnificent tomb, and the tide of the Father of Waters rolling all the way to the Gulf of Mexico and on to the Atlantic Ocean probably furnished to him a funeral train such as was never the lot of any other man in history or romance.

In the rotunda of the Capitol, under the dome, there are eight great pictures portraying the life of America from the romantic and historical standpoint. One picture, by William H. Powell, portrays the wonder and amazement of De Soto and his followers when they beheld the Father of Waters gliding southward in its solemn, majestic sweep to the Mexican sea. Years and years elapsed, and in 1673 we find Joliet and Marquette descending the Mississippi River, under the direction of the French Governor of Canada, in search of the mighty river that was supposed to run from east to west and connect the two great oceans. Then they returned, having gone as far south as the Arkansas River.

Strange as it may appear, the idea that a great river ran from east to west and connected the eastern and western oceans remained even among educated people for over a century after these great explorers had gone to that undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler has ever returned, and I understand that in South America there is still a disposition to believe that there is such a waterway.

Only lately down in Panama it was thought that the Chagres River at one time did make a connection between the two great bodies of water. It is said that Balboa, when he viewed from the hill that bears his name the mighty Pacific, looked for the river that he thought joined it to the Atlantic.

In 1682 La Salle completed the discovery of the Mississippi River and claimed the whole country for France, naming it Louisiana, in honor of Louis XIV.

It is clear from this recital that there must have been an issue between France and Spain in regard to the immense territory involved and flowing from the right of discovery. This is made certain by the fact that in 1762 France, by treaty of Fontainebleau, ceded to Spain all that part of the Louisiana Territory lying west of the Mississippi River and the island of Orleans, which is to-day New Orleans, and in the following year, 1763, by the treaty of Paris, surrendered all of that part of the territory lying on the right bank, and Florida, to England. The desire of Napoleon to create a colonial empire in America led to the secret treaty of St. Ildefonso, in 1800, by which France acquired that part of Louisiana formerly ceded to Spain.

This acquisition by the great Corsican and the treaty by which France secured it was denounced as fraudulent by Spain and England, and Napoleon transferred it to the United States for \$15,000,000, as he feared an invasion of the Louisiana Territory by England and wished to make us its defenders. Matters drifted as Napoleon was then at the zenith of his power and the terror of Europe. Then came that terrible day for him and joy for Europe when he had to abdicate and fly to Elba in the early summer of 1814.

England was now in control of the world. Up to this time she was successful in the War of 1812, her chief triumph being the capture and burning of our Capitol. London newspapers teemed with accounts of her easy victory and triumphs and ridiculed a people that could not offer a soldier's resistance to the invaders of their country. Our President and Army—in fact, the population—were mercilessly lampooned upon the stage and derided and sneered and scoffed at in the English journals of the time. Flushed with success on the Continent, England now determined to settle with the infant Republic and give her a military lesson that would break her spirit completely. Therefore one of the conditions to be imposed upon France was the return of Louisiana to Spain and which England would take from us if her ally should not be strong enough to do so for herself.

It was indeed a day of appalling danger for our country. The entire valley was to be trampled under military heel. An immensely large force for that time was to embark from Plymouth for the conquest of the Gulf States, the control of the Mississippi Valley, and the occupancy of the Louisiana Purchase. This army was composed of men who had been under Wellington in the Peninsular wars. General Ross was to have commanded this invading army after Wellington declined its command, but Ross was killed on the banks of the Patapsco and Sir Edward Pakenham was placed in charge, the Duke of Wellington having again declined the command.

It was a dark period for our country. The old martial spirit of the Revolution seemed to be dead. The war was far from arousing any patriotic enthusiasm.

It is clear that if another disaster had befallen our arms instead of the triumph that we won, if another defeat had been our fate, we would have been crushed and overwhelmed by such a catastrophe; England would have occupied New Orleans and taken possession of the Louisiana Territory without another blow, as we would have been at her mercy.

We had sent James Bayard, John Quincy Adams, Henry Clay, Jonathan Russell, and Albert Gallatin to secure a treaty of peace. But even while the treaty was being discussed the London Sun, as well as the Canadian newspapers, looked forward to and predicted the annihilation of what they scornfully refused to recognize as a military force.

Our peace commissioners were subject to mortification. Michigan, Wisconsin, Ohio, and Indiana were demanded as an evidence of our defeat. This was on September 8, 1814. It is needless to say that these demands were promptly refused by our commissioners.

Keep this fact in mind, my countrymen, for the seeming friend of to-day may be the enemy of to-morrow, and that eternal vigilance and watchfulness are necessary to safeguard the interest and unity of the Nation. For on October 24, six weeks later, Lord Bathurst gave Pakenham his commission and orders to proceed to Plymouth and embark there for Louisiana to assume command of the forces operating for the reduction of that province. All of these warlike preparations were being made while the peace conference was in session at Ghent.

Yes; eternal vigilance is the price, or a part of the price, we must pay to preserve our liberties, our freedom, our institutions. Self-reliance, preparedness, training, resolution, and fortitude should be the cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night to guide us along the road to the goal of our country. Alliances, except for the purpose of trade, do not appeal to a bold and militant people. Courage and that discipline which comes as a result of training from the cradle until the patriot steps on the battlefield or the deck of his country's war vessel are what makes for a nation's perpetuation and its glory.

It is true a treaty of peace was signed, but let us not forget that it was not a spirit of generosity on the part of England that led to the abandonment of her extraordinary claims and proposed indemnities as an evidence of our humiliation, but because she was assured just at this time and believed that we were so torn and worn by dissension, so near exhaustion, that dissolution was inevitable and that the dismembered States would seek a new and closer alliance with her as separate and distinct dependencies. In other words, she hoped to secure more by what she considered the inevitable process of dissolution that her informants thought they saw in operation than by force of arms or a too exacting treaty and the harsh terms she had intended to impose. She had not relinquished her rights in the Louisiana Purchase on behalf of Spain nor had she abandoned her plans to control the Mississippi, for the Pakenham expedition had been hurried across the Atlantic and assembled at Negril, Jamaica, with a full civil government for the Crown Province of Louisiana, as it was referred to by England, and no effort was made to recall it.

As a matter of fact, all plans for the invasion and occupancy of the Louisiana Territory were being actively pushed while the peace conference was in session. Do not ever forget this; keep it in mind, lest on some tremendous day we have to pay for our carelessness in blood and tears.

Just at this critical time in the history of our country there loomed on its horizon one who became a great figure in the affairs of this world, one who came out of the woods, like Hosea of old. Tried by obscurity, poverty, pain, danger, and the malevolence that always assails merit, he had overcome disappointment, surmounted every obstacle, subdued and triumphed over every disaster. The perils of the wilderness, the hostility of the savage, the silent antagonism of the trackless swamps and the unbroken forest, melted into thin air before the dauntless courage and martial fire of this hero, warrior, statesman, patriot, and American, Andrew Jackson, whose fiery heart never quailed before any foe, whose crest was never lowered to any enemy.

His fame as an Indian fighter, his wonderful march against Pensacola, his defense of Fort Bower had reached Europe, and Wellington saw flashing across the military skies, not a meteor, dazzling in its brightness for a moment only to plunge into everlasting gloom and darkness, but a rising star of the first magnitude.

I will not dwell upon Pakenham's advance up the Gulf of Mexico and through Lake Borgne, nor upon the skirmish by lake and land, by river and bayou, that preceded the memorable conflict on the 8th of January, 1815.

From this Spartan message vision the glory of our victory—the tragedy of their defeat:

American loss: 7 killed and 6 wounded.

English loss: 700 killed, 1,400 wounded, and 500 prisoners. Among the slain being Pakenham, the gallant leader of the invading force. As are Leonidas and Thermopylae Pass to Greece, are Jackson and New Orleans to Americans.

Pakenham was killed. His army, or what was left of it, was withdrawn and afterwards took part in the battle of Waterloo, securing for themselves the sobriquet of "The Invincibles."

The compensation of life—a Chalmette and a Waterloo—for them a disaster and then a triumph.

On what slight things does destiny hang her judgments? In 1762 England had her choice of American territory from France, and she demanded and received the right bank and the Floridas. Had she requested and received the west bank, or the Louisiana Purchase as it was later known, how different might have been our

[illegible]

Apportionment of each number of Representatives from 435 to 537, inclusive, according to the method of major fractions used in the last preceding apportionment, 1930—Continued

States	Number of Representatives—Continued																
Total	465	466	467	468	469	470	471	472	473	474	475	476	477	478	479		
Georgia	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
Idaho	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Illinois	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	30	30	30	30	30
Indiana	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13
Iowa	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Kansas	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Kentucky	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Louisiana	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Maine	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Maryland	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Massachusetts	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	17	17	17	17	17
Michigan	18	18	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19
Minnesota	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Mississippi	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Missouri	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14
Montana	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Nebraska	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Nevada	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
New Hampshire	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
New Jersey	15	15	15	15	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
New Mexico	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
New York	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	49	49	49	49	49	49	49	49
North Carolina	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
North Dakota	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Ohio	25	25	25	25	25	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
Oklahoma	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
Oregon	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Pennsylvania	36	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	38	38
Rhode Island	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
South Carolina	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
South Dakota	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Tennessee	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Texas	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	23	23	23	23	23	23
Utah	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Vermont	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Virginia	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
Washington	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
West Virginia	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Wisconsin	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	12
Wyoming	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

[illegible][illegible]

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

(10 a. m.)

Authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to convey certain land to the city of Asheville, N. C., for park and street purposes. (H. R. 14696.)

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(10.30 a. m.)

To consider farm loan drought bills.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(9.30 a. m.)

Legislative appropriation bill.

(10.30 a. m.)

District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Navy Department appropriation bill.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

785. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination and survey of Allegheny River, Pa. and N. Y. (H. Doc. No. 721); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

786. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and repeal certain provisions of the act of May 25, 1926, as amended, known as the public buildings act; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

787. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to authorize the exchange of rights of way, the transfer of land, and the closing and opening of certain streets in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. WILLIAMSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. S. 3277. An act to provide against the withholding of pay when employees are removed for breach of contract to render faithful service; without amendment (Rept. No. 2301). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 11979. A bill authorizing disposition of the effects of persons dying in the military services of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. EATON of Colorado: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 15876. A bill to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOOPER: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 9333. A bill for the relief of volunteer officers and soldiers in the volunteer service of the United States who served in the Philippine Islands beyond the period of their enlistment, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2304). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HOOPER: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 1611. A bill for the relief of George B. Marx; with amendment (Rept. No. 2305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PEAVEY: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 12867. A bill to authorize and adjust the claim of the estate of Thomas Bird; without amendment (Rept. No. 2306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PEAVEY: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 13092. A bill to authorize and adjust and settle the claim of Leslie W. Morse; without amendment (Rept. No. 2307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13274) granting a pension to Georgia J. Jackson; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 15634) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Nichols; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DORSEY: A bill (H. R. 16333) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River approximately midway between the cities of Owensboro, Ky., and Rockport, Ind.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SELVIG: A bill (H. R. 16334) to extend the times for the commencement and completion of the bridge of the county of Norman and the town and village of Halstad, in said county, in the State of Minnesota, and the county of Traill and the town of Herberg, in said county, in the State of North Dakota, across the Red River of the North on the boundary line between said States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 16335) to amend section 24 of the Judicial Code by conferring on district courts jurisdiction of proceedings in the nature of bills of interpleader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 16336) to facilitate the use and occupancy of national forest lands for purposes of residence, recreation, education, industry, and commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 16337) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Black River at or near Pocahontas, Ark.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 16338) prohibiting the purchase by the United States Government for use in any of its institutions or lines of activity of oleomargarine or other substitutes for butter and thereby promote the public health and aid the dairy industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YON: A bill (H. R. 16339) to permit certain veterans to purchase stores and supplies from the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 16340) to amend the act approved March 4, 1929, entitled "An act to provide for the enlarging of the Capitol Grounds"; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 16341) to authorize 24-hour quarantine inspection service in certain ports of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAMES of Michigan (at the request of the War Department): A bill (H. R. 16342) to authorize the acquisition of land in connection with the water supply of the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 16343) to provide for the demolition of certain existing structures and the erection of a new building for the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 16344) to amend the first paragraph of section 24 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 16345) to regulate interstate transportation of wood alcohol; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 16346) for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Fifteenth Census; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 16347) placing service postmasters in the classified service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. ESLICK: A bill (H. R. 16348) defining as nonmailable any published or written matter advocating or supporting communism, and providing penalties therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. McKEOWN: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the Congress of the United States to use the wheat now held by the Federal Farm Board to feed the hungry, starving, and destitute men, women, and children of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation restraining the importation of foreign oils; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Oklahoma memorializing the Congress of the United States to require the Farm Relief Board to use the wheat now held by the board for the hungry, starving, and destitute men, women, and children of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Oklahoma memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact a tariff on oil and its refined products, and to provide further relief for the oil industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEEDY: A bill (H. R. 16349) granting a pension to Ada May Fuller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 16350) granting an increase of pension to Jennie C. Wakefield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 16351) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Pillsbury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 16352) for the relief of Hattie E. Huffman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 16353) for the relief of E. E. Carroll; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 16354) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Shannon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULKIN: A bill (H. R. 16355) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Adsit; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16356) granting a pension to May E. Parkhurst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16357) granting a pension to Fred Poole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16358) granting an increase of pension to Frances M. Hayden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 16359) for the relief of James C. Chisholm; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 16360) for the relief of Constance B. Shuler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 16361) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. McKee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOFFMAN: A bill (H. R. 16362) granting an increase of pension to Mercy J. Havens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 16363) granting an increase of pension to Emeline Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16364) granting an increase of pension to Salina Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUDLOW: A bill (H. R. 16365) granting a pension to Callie J. Feaster; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 16366) for the relief of Stillwell Bros. (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 16367) granting an increase of pension to Cora B. Sollers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 16368) granting a pension to Silas Overmire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. OWEN: A bill (H. R. 16369) granting an increase of pension to Bridget Sheppard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKS: A bill (H. R. 16370) for the relief of the lawful heirs of James Aikin; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FRANK M. RAMEY: A bill (H. R. 16371) granting an increase of pension to Sue L. Plowman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 16372) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHORT of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 16373) granting a pension to Stillman Garrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16374) granting an increase of pension to Susie C. Battles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16375) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Abbott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16376) granting a pension to Sophia Springer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 16377) granting an increase of pension to Lucy A. Farington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16378) granting a pension to Julia A. Green; to the committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YON: A bill (H. R. 16379) for the relief of John W. Walthers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 16380) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Santman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16381) granting a pension to Elizabeth Jane Barnhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES of Michigan (at the request of the War Department): Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 472) to authorize the acceptance on behalf of the United States of the bequest of the late William F. Edgar, of Los Angeles County, State of California, for the benefit of the museum and library connected with the office of the Surgeon General of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8691. By Mr. BRIGGS: Telegram of Carl Nessler, of the Mainland Chamber of Commerce, Texas City, Tex., urging the passage of House bill 9599; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8692. Also, telegram of Galveston Chamber of Commerce, urging the passage of House bill 9599; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8693. Also, telegram of James Hogg Young Post, No. 373, American Legion, Hull-Daisetta, Tex., urging payment in full of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8694. By Mr. BRUNNER: Resolution of John J. Haspel Post, No. 551, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Elmhurst, Long Island, N. Y., favoring immediate enactment of House bill 3493, introduced by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, providing for immediate payment in cash of the face value of

adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8695. Also, petition of 100 citizens of the second Queensborough (N. Y.) district, favoring the dog exemption bill (H. R. 7884); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8696. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of A. G. Hummel, commander of the American Legion of Madison, Ind., and six other prominent citizens of Madison, Ind., urging the passage of legislation to provide a full-time, paid chaplain for every veterans' hospital, including those planned for future building; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

8697. By Mr. CANNON: Petition of St. Charles County (Mo.) Farm Bureau, suggesting that the Federal Government through appropriations provide a market for securities of the Federal land banks and joint-stock land banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8698. By Mr. CLARKE of New York: Petition of the members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Binghamton, N. Y., urging Congress to enact a law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures, establishing higher standards before production for films that are to be licensed for interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8699. Also, petition of the members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Walton, N. Y., urging Congress to enact a law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures, establishing higher standards before production for films that are to be licensed for interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8700. By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petitions of Frederick H. Rike, president, Rike Kumler Co.; John C. Haswell, president, Dayton Malleable Iron Co.; George W. Lane, president, Dayton Real Estate Board; Harry R. Blagg, president, Dayton Builders Exchange; John Q. Sherman, president, Standard Register Co.; George B. Smith, secretary to C. F. Kettering, vice president, General Motors Corporation, all of Dayton, Ohio; and Fred D. Connolley, executive director, Columbus (Ohio) Chamber of Commerce, protesting against Government operation of Muscle Shoals and advocating sale or lease to private operatives; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8701. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of residents of Battle Creek, Mich., urging Congress to enact legislation for the Federal supervision of motion pictures establishing higher moral standards before production of films that are to be licensed for interstate and international commerce as provided in the Grant-Hudson motion-picture bill (H. R. 9986); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8702. By Mr. LEA: Petition of 20 residents of Marin County, Calif., and 1 resident of Eureka, Calif., favoring passage of House bill 7884, for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8703. By Mr. NOLAN: Petition of Mother Club, of Minneapolis, Minn., urging the enactment of law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures establishing higher standards before production of films that are to be licensed for interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8704. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of American Legion Post, of Fergus Falls, Minn., urging the enactment of the bill providing for the immediate payment of the face value of the World War adjusted-service compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8705. Also, petition of American Legion Post, of Battle Lake, Minn., favoring immediate payment of full face value of the United States World War veterans adjusted-service compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8706. Also, petition of American Legion Post, of Hendrum, Minn., urging early enactment of legislation providing for payment at full face value of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8707. By Mr. SHOT'T of West Virginia: Memorial of Princeton Post, No. 54, American Legion, of Princeton,

W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 3493, providing for payment to veterans of the World War the face value of their adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8708. By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: Petition of more than a thousand citizens of the eighth congressional district of Michigan, urging the immediate passage of legislation for payment of adjusted-compensation certificates in cash; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8709. Also, petition of citizens of Alma, Belding, Owosso, St. Johns, and Sheridan, Mich., urging the passage of House bill 7884, providing for the exemption of dogs for vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8710. By Mr. WELCH of California: Petition of citizens of the fifth congressional district, San Francisco, Calif., urging the enactment of House bill 7884; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8711. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of 121 members of Holy Family Branch, No. 854, Ladies' Catholic Benevolent Association, protesting against Senate Joint Resolution No. 52; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8712. Also, petition of Irwin Ministerial Association, Irwin, Pa., urging support of Sparks-Capper amendment to Constitution, eliminating approximately 7,500,000 unnaturalized aliens in new congressional apportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8713. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Adolph Pfund, National Retail Lumber Dealers' Association, Chicago, Ill., urging the passage of Senate bill 5370; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8714. Also, petition of W. P. Cronnell, 103 South Mason Avenue, Chicago, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 10821, relative to vocational education; to the Committee on Education.

8715. Also, petition of W. F. Hanselman, 416 Sunnyside Avenue, Elmhurst, Ill., requesting the passage of Reed-Capper educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1931

(Legislative day of Monday, January 5, 1931)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	King	Sheppard
Barkley	Frazier	La Follette	Shipstead
Bingham	George	McGill	Shortridge
Black	Gillett	McKellar	Smith
Blaine	Glass	McMaster	Smoot
Borah	Glenn	McNary	Steiwer
Bratton	Goff	Metcalf	Stephens
Brock	Goldsborough	Morrison	Swanson
Brookhart	Gould	Morrow	Thomas, Idaho
Broussard	Hale	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Bulkeley	Harris	Norbeck	Townsend
Capper	Harrison	Norris	Trammell
Caraway	Hatfield	Nye	Tydings
Connally	Hawes	Oddie	Vandenberg
Copeland	Hayden	Partridge	Wagner
Couzens	Hebert	Patterson	Walcott
Cutting	Heflin	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Howell	Pine	Walsh, Mont.
Davis	Jones	Pittman	Watson
Deneen	Kean	Reed	Wheeler
Dill	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.	Williamson
Fess	Keyes	Schall	

Mr. BROUSSARD. I wish to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] is necessarily detained from the Senate by illness.

Mr. WATSON. My colleague the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] is necessarily detained on account of illness in his family. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.